

FIRST INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF THE ADVISORY BOARD OF THE THEOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF THE QUMRAN TEXTS

(Bonn, 3.-5. November 2008)

Introduction

How to compose a Theological Dictionary of the Dead Sea Scrolls? This topic was discussed — generally and in detail — at the First International Symposium of the Advisory Board of the “Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumrantexten” (ThWQ) from 2nd to 5th November 2008 in Bonn. The proceedings of this conference are summarised here.

The guidelines for this project are similar to those of its predecessor, the famous “Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament”, but have been adapted to the peculiarities of the new project. The first contributions to the ThWQ were received towards the end of 2008, and this conference provided a good opportunity to reflect upon the hermeneutical and methodological approaches towards the specific challenges relating to the Dead Sea Scrolls.

The ThWQ marks the beginning of a new phase in Qumran research. This has been enabled by the recent publication of the official edition of all the texts from the Judean desert. (1) Intended as a

(1) The last two volumes of the edition of the non-biblical texts were recently published; cf. H. Stegemann, E. Schuller, and C. Newsom, *Qumran Cave 1 III. 1QHodayot^a with Incorporation of 1QHodayot^b and 4QHodayot^{c-f}* (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009); É. Puech, *Qumrân grotte 4 XXVII. Textes araméens, Deuxième partie* (DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon, 2009); and the Re-edition of the Cave I Isaiah manuscripts as Vol. 32 of the DJD series is announced to be published in November 2009.

“word-orientated” project, (2) the ThWQ conducts individual analyses of nearly 800 lexemes and attempts to decipher the semantic and theological value of the vocabulary of the Dead Sea Scrolls, including its extensions, limitations and shifts in meaning.

It is important to incorporate the peculiarities of the Hebrew language, which is clearly in a long term process of development spanning from the time of the Hebrew Bible up to the mishnaic/rabbinic literature. For the Qumran literature this means: the frequent adoption of loan-words from Aramaic, Persian and Greek, new phrases and syntactical constructions, shifts in the syntagmatic usage and semantic valence of many terms. These investigations contribute towards a better understanding of a “theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls”, more specifically of the time period in which they were written and of the actual spectrum of writings spanning from the 4th century BCE to the first century CE. During the publication of the “Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament” the importance of this new literary material became increasingly apparent for our understanding of the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament and Early Judaism. The DSS has improved our knowledge of the history and religious developments in the so-called “inter-testamental” period.

One of the most important outstanding questions is that of the *dating* of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Palaeographical and/or physical evidence help to determine dating, but are insufficient when used exclusively. This is because they only assist in determining when the text was copied, but give no evidence as to when it was first written down, nor as to the redactional process which the text has undergone. In recent years textual dating has become increasingly precise. Various efforts have helped us to determine the semantic development of the meaning of the lexemes, as well as the development of the religious and theological thoughts which existed in the period in which the texts were created.

If we attempt to date a text based on information gained from its content we are very quickly confronted with the *distinction* between *sectarian* and *non-sectarian texts*. These terms are only termini technici and mean that a text was either created within the Qumran community or external to it. This must not be a question of diachrony. Beyond this, early Jewish literature also exists which is clearly non-sectarian, but contemporaneous to the Qumran texts. These issues were discussed in the contributions from Deborah Dimant and Francesco Zanella, and also in an English version of an already published paper by Florentino García Martínez. (3) The main

(2) Not as an “ideas-orientated” project, such as the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000).

(3) F. García Martínez, “¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos”, *RevQ* 23 (2007/08), 383-394.

point of this discussion was to determine whether this distinction is useful and necessary, or whether we have to view the texts from Qumran as a closed corpus.

If we analyse the meaning of the individual lexemes, the significant usage of single words in certain *literary genres* plays an important role. Particular attention should be paid, for instance, to the pesharim (George Brooke), to the wisdom texts (Torleif Elgvin), and to the so-called sectarian *S*- and *D*-texts (Charlotte Hempel; Sarianna Metso)

Some texts occasionally exhibit a *special vocabulary*, which sometimes requires fundamental re-analysis, e.g. terms of purity and impurity (Hannah Harrington), halakhic terminology (Lawrence Schiffman) and organizational terminology (Sarianna Metso).

The relative importance of some *historical and biblical figures* and individuals who feature in the Dead Sea Scrolls, should be taken into consideration. Charlotte Hempel is assessing the role of Aaron, and made some helpful contributions. New associations are being forged with certain biblical figures (Noach, Melchizedek), and the development of other fields of historical and theological research (messianism, apocalypticism, resurrection) can be traced more precisely.

The question of *diachrony and synchrony*, of redaction-critical developments in the texts, was dealt with in each of these contributions.

In his contribution Armin Lange demonstrates the importance of considering contemporary literature in the analysis of single lexemes. He encourages authors to consider the lexeme's function in the late texts of the Hebrew Bible as well as in the apocrypha (2nd century BCE til 2nd century CE) and Mishnaic literature.

The *Aramaic texts* found at Qumran form a separate group (cluster?) of texts. Holger Gzella initiated a stimulating discussion by raising the issue of whether and how these texts should be taken into consideration in the ThWQ.

Among the Qumran texts exist nearly 200 *biblical manuscripts*, pesharim, reworked and rewritten texts and many biblical quotations. Their relevance for textual history and textual criticism is well-known. The multitude of variants in these texts seems to be intentional and deserves to be carefully considered and documented in the ThWQ. (4)

As a general rule the ThWQ will only admit lexemes which are attested (readable and not in a broken or fragmentary status) (5) at

(4) Cf. the textual variant (דבק instead of רבץ) in *Deut* 29:19 in *4QDtn^c* fragm. 53,5, which has strong parallels in *IQS* II,15-16 and *CD* I,17. Cf. U. Dahmen, "Das Deuteronomium in Qumran als umgeschriebene Bibel," in *Das Deuteronomium* (ed. G. Braulik; Österreichische Biblische Studien 23; Frankfurt: Lang, 2003), 295-296.

(5) E.g. the words ברה 'to flee'; בריח 'bolt'; גבלה 'carcasse' and ספחת 'scab' were cut off, because it seemed not to be convenient to analyze them.

least five times. Ideosyncracies, particularly those found in astrological and liturgical texts, are also to be taken into account, even when they occur less than five times. The selection process is still under consideration and requires further discussion.

The conference closed with a discussion of further formal and technical matters. The first of (the projected) three volumes of the ThWQ is expected to go to print in spring 2010.

Ulrich DAHMEN

SECTARIAN AND NON-SECTARIAN TEXTS FROM QUMRAN: THE PERTINENCE AND USAGE OF A TAXONOMY

MORE than sixty years have elapsed since the scholarly community and the public at large first became acquainted with the Dead Sea Scrolls as a corpus of writings discovered in the caves near Qumran, close to the western shore of the Dead Sea. Only now, however, has the publication of all the scrolls initially discovered been concluded. (1) At the end of this process we possess fragments of more than a thousand scrolls, the majority written in Hebrew, some in Aramaic, and a small number in Greek. But a considerable part of the initial discoveries in the rich cave 4 remained unpublished for many years. The irregular and long publication process generated two stages in the research. During the first thirty years scholarly discussion was based mainly on the first scrolls discovered in cave 1 with a few additions from cave 4. Most of the cave 1 documents belonged to the literature of a specific ascetic community, and therefore have been labeled the sectarian texts. This is why the early research depicted the Qumran library as wholly concerned with this community. But at the second stage, extending over the last two decades, the publication of the remaining texts of cave 4 has altered the picture. We now know that around a third of the manuscripts in the Qumran library do not display the characteristics typical of the literature of that community so presumably they were not authored by its members. These non-sectarian texts are clearly differentiated from

(1) The last volumes of the official publication of the scrolls, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*, have just appeared in print: volume 37 (É. Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4. XXVII: Textes Araméens, deuxième partie*; [DJD 37; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2009]) and volume 40 (H. Stegemann and E. Schuller, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a* [DJD 40; Oxford: University Press, 2009]). New editions of *DJD* volume 5 and the Great Isaiah Scroll (*IQIs^a*) are still awaited

the sectarian ones by style, theme and vocabulary. The sectarian writings depict the community's organization, ideology and political and theological controversies. Organizational matters are detailed in the *Rule of the Community* (IQS) and the *Damascus Document* (CD). They contain a set of rules for the community's functioning and its members' behavior. A series of commentaries on the biblical prophecies, the *pesharim*, reveal the polemics of this community against its theological rivals and political opponents. Other writings, such as the Psalms-like *Hodayot* (IQH^a), or the description of the final eschatological end in the *War Scroll* (IQM), convey much of the specific ideology and religious worldview of this community. All these writings are linked by particular lexical locutions, phraseology and nomenclature. The specificity of this sectarian corpus became apparent when the last unpublished texts from cave 4 appeared on the scene during the last twenty years. Besides additional copies of the already known sectarian works from cave 1, most of the new cave 4 texts were not specifically related to the Qumran community. Many of them rework and rewrite the Hebrew Bible in ways widely practiced in non-Qumranic literature. In a first attempt at sorting out the various types of the Qumran documents, which I published thirteen years ago, I showed that the sectarian texts account for about 25% of the library, whereas non-sectarian texts constitute 30% of the collection. (2) Essentially this classification has been accepted in research, as was my attempt to establish the fundamental distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts, not clear at the time. Recent developments in Qumran research have shown, I believe, that this distinction is indispensable for understanding the true nature of the Qumran collection. However, the initial taxonomy was made on basis of lists and photographs available at the time, before the entire library was published and accessible for study. (3) It therefore needs updating, refining and development in light of the new materials and fresh insights gained by the ongoing study of the scrolls. (4)

(2) Cf. D. Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in D. Dimant and L. Schiffman (eds.), *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness* (STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 23-58.

(3) Charlotte Hempel has criticized this classification, arguing that it fails to take into consideration the sources underlying the various sectarian compositions. However, she disregards the fact that my article reflected the state of research and data available at the time, prior to the full publication of all the scrolls from Caves 4 and 11. See eadem, "Kriterien zur Bestimmung 'essenischer Verfasserschaft' von Qumrantexten," in J. Frey and H. Stegemann (eds.), *Qumran kontrovers* (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 71-85, esp. pp. 80-81.

(4) Florentino García Martínez has recently questioned the validity of the entire taxonomy of sectarian versus non-sectarian texts. See idem, "Sectario, No-sectario, o Qué?" *RevQ* 23 (2007/08): 383-394. A summary of his argument is included in idem, "Aramaica qumranica apocalyptica?" in K. Berthelot and D. Stoeckl (eds.), *Aramaica Qumranica: The Aix-en-Provence Colloquium on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls*

To advance the understanding of the specific character of the sectarian texts I have undertaken an analysis of their lexical and terminological features. (5) This study demonstrates in detail the particularity of the sectarian literature. It is based on the following principles:

First, the analysis pertains to the non-biblical texts. The sectarian literature, being the most specific and peculiar, rather than the non-sectarian corpus, was selected as the object of the analysis. **Secondly**, since the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts is by nature linguistic and literary, no historical or sociological considerations are taken into account for they are of a different order. Previous attempts to define the sectarian texts were flawed precisely because they used historically bound definitions, such as “pre-Qumranic.” (6) **Thirdly**, the Qumran corpus is treated as a single contemporary entity. As is well known, no data are available that permit the precise dating of the original sectarian compositions, for the Qumran collection consists mostly of copies, not autographs. **Fourthly**, the manuscripts or works are considered single units, and in the form they were initially discovered, without taking into account underlying independent units. (7) To date no consensus has been reached on the nature and complex character of individual sectarian works, so it is premature to dissect and treat them as amalgams of distinct sources. The criteria proposed for identifying sectarian provenance may indeed be applied to sources which underlie the sectarian works as we have them today. But this should be done only when the

(STDJ; Leiden: Brill) (in press). However, the arguments he adduces in support of his criticism do not address the pertinent data, nor can they obliterate the distinct style, vocabulary and terminology displayed by the sectarian texts, and not shared by other Qumran manuscripts. These facts need to be investigated and explained.

(5) See D. Dimant, “Criteria for the identification of Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in M. Kister (ed.), *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (Jerusalem, 2009), vol. 1, 49-86 (Hebrew); *eadem*, “The Vocabulary of Qumran Sectarian Texts,” in C. Claussen and J. Frey (eds.), *Qumran and Archaeology* (in press).

(6) For instance, Herman Lichtenberger and Esther Chazon have argued that any scroll dated prior to the sect’s origins — according to the scholarly consensus, around the middle of the second century B.C.E. — should not be assigned to the scrolls community. Cf. H. Lichtenberger, *Studien zum Menschenbild in Texten der Qumrangemeinde* (SUNT 15; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980), 15-17; E.G. Chazon, “Is *Divrei Ha-Me’orot* a Sectarian Prayer?” in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (STDJ 10; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 13-17. However, the dating of the community’s origins is based on a historical reconstruction which is still debated among scholars. Today archaeologists incline to agree that the community only settled at Qumran around 100 B.C.E., fifty years later than the date previously assigned to this event. See e.g. J. Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 2002), 65-66. In any case, it is clearly implausible to base a set of criteria on data external to the literary character of the scrolls themselves.

(7) See above n. 3.

basic taxonomy of the intact documents is complete, which it is not, by any means.

The Classification

The classification itself is based on a list of lexical criteria drawn from a representative group. That group consists of the following texts: the *rules* (*Rule of the Community*, *Rule of the Congregation*, *Rule of Benedictions*, *Damascus Document*, *War rule*), the *pesharim* and the *Hodayot*. The particular sectarian vocabulary is examined under three types: the **first** consists of terms related to the organization of the community. Words such as *Yahad* (יהד), the community's self-designation, or מבקר ("overseer"), are typical of this class of terms. Such words are patently related to the Qumran community since they explicitly refer to it. They constitute the clearest sectarian markers of the texts that contain them. Under the **second** heading are assembled locutions alluding to the historical circumstances of the community. They appear mainly in the *pesharim* and the *Damascus Document*. Typical examples are the cryptic epithets given to various historical figures, such as מורה הצדק ("the Teacher of Righteousness"), מטיף הכזב ("the Spouter of Lies") or דורשי החלקות ("the Seekers of Smooth Things"). The appearance of such epithets, or of references to events connected with these figures and their followers, assigns the texts in question to the sectarian literature. Under the **third** heading are treated terms which denote religious ideas. Here, for instance, belongs the dualistic terminology, expressed in pairs such as בני אור ("sons of light") versus בני חושך ("sons of darkness"), or the word גורל ("a lot") in the sense of a group of beings belonging to the sphere of light or to the sphere of darkness. Yet the theological vocabulary appearing in sectarian texts often has close parallels in non-sectarian, at times even non-Qumranic compositions. This is illustrated by the same pair, the "sons of light" and "sons of darkness," for they occur in the non-sectarian Aramaic composition the *Visions of Amram*. (8) The similarity observed between sectarian dualistic ideas and some of the views held by the New Testament authors is another case in point. (9) In fact, dualistic

(8) Cf. 4Q548 1 ii–2 11,16 where the terms בני נהורא and בני חשוכא turn up.

(9) Such terms are present in the *Gospel of John* (cf. e.g. *John* 1:4–9, 8:12,35). For views that these terms are not directly connected with sectarian ideas see J. Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library," in M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen (eds.), *Legal Texts and Legal Issues* (STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335, esp. p. 335; R. Bauckham, "The Qumran Community and the Gospel of John," in L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years after Their Discovery 1947–1997* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society/The Shrine of the Book, Israel Museum, 2000), 105–115.

elements in various forms are found in many works outside the sectarian sphere. (10)

These cases show that while the sectarian terms of the first two categories are specific, occur only in sectarian texts, and thus constitute clear markers of sectarian provenance, the terms of theological import are more general and are at times shared by texts outside the sectarian sphere. The occurrence of dualistic terms, for instance, in various compositions not composed by the Qumran community, reflects the wide dissemination of such notions in the Jewish literature of Second Temple times. The same may be said of vocabulary expressing deterministic or apocalyptic views. The fact that theological modes of expression appearing in the sectarian texts have often close counterparts in other types of literary documents suggests that in this domain the Qumran community adopted and developed notions diffused outside its immediate orbit. The occurrence of a single religious term, such as the Light/Darkness dichotomy, is thus insufficient to determine the sectarian provenance of a given text. The sectarian character of any document may be established only when distinctive theological terms appear in conjunction with organizational or polemical nomenclature of the first two categories. The frequency of such theological terms, and their particular formulation, must also be taken into account.

The mapping of the sectarian terminology permits us to ascertain that a number of texts, whose character has been disputed, are clearly sectarian. Such is, for instance, the case of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4Q400-4Q407, 11Q17, MasShirShabb). In spite of the initial doubts of the first editor, (11) this work is undoubtedly sectarian, as indicated by distinctive sectarian terms scattered in it. (12) Another case is the sapiential work 4QInstruction. Again, its clearly sectarian character comes out through the usage of distinctive sectarian nomenclature. (13)

(10) See, for instance, the *Aramaic Levi Document* (4Q213 4,1-6) and the *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542 2,11-12).

(11) See C.A. Newsom, "'Sectually Explicit' Literature from Qumran," in W.H. Propp, B. Halpern, and D.N. Friedman (eds.), *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 167-187, esp. p. 185; J.H. Charlesworth and C.A. Newsom, *Angelic Liturgy: Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (The Dead Sea Scrolls 4B; Tübingen/Louisville: Mohr-Siebeck/John Knox, 1999), 5.

(12) Compare, for instance, שְׁבִי פֶשַׁע ("the penitents of sin") in 4Q400 1i16 with CD II,5; XX,17, תְּמִימֵי דֶרֶךְ ("[the] perfect of way") in 4Q403 1 i 22; 4Q404 2,3; 4Q405 13,6 with IQM XIV,7; IQH^a IX (I),38, and עַם בְּיִתּוֹ ("a people of discernment") in 4Q400 1 i 6 with CD V,16, IQH^a X (II),21.

(13) Compare, in example, the dualistic overtones of the pairing אֱמֶת עוֹל / in 4Q417 1i6 (וְאֵת דְּרַע אֱמֶת וְעוֹל) — "and then thou shall know truth and iniquity") with the *Rule of the Community* הֵנָּה רֻחוֹת הָאֱמֶת וְהָעוֹל ("these are the Spirits of Truth and Perversity" — IQS III,19; cf. IQS IV,23; IQM XIII,12), or the designation בְּנֵי אֱמֶתוֹ ("the sons of His truth") in 4Q416 1,10 with IQM XVII,8; IQH^a XIV (VI) 32. A third example is offered by the phrase לְפִי רֹב נִחַלֵּת אִישׁ בְּאֵמֶת ("according to the size

An additional result of this study is the confirmation of an earlier observation, namely that the Aramaic texts found at Qumran are non-sectarian. In fact, the Aramaic texts constitute a distinct group within the non-sectarian texts. They differ from the Hebrew ones in language, but also in their themes and their approach to reworking the Hebrew Bible. (14) Their theological and religious idiosyncrasies should therefore be kept separate from those of the Hebrew texts, and be independently analyzed and discussed.

Two Qumran texts are specimens not easily classified according to the proposed taxonomy: the halakhic letter, so-called *Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (= 4QMMT; 4Q394-4Q399), and the *Commentary on Genesis* (4Q252, 4Q254). 4QMMT is a text in the form of a letter, preserved in six or seven copies at Qumran. The letter is an address of the community to the leader of another group, listing halakhic issues in dispute between the two. This is undoubtedly a sectarian text as is evident from its subject matter: the explicit polemics and the attitude to Jewish religious law shared with the Qumran sectarian texts. But 4QMMT does not use a single sectarian term, nor is it written in the peculiar style of the sectarian scrolls. It is formulated in Mishnaic Hebrew, a late Hebrew dialect, current in Jewish writings during the Second Temple period and later. Indeed, the Letter is obviously written for addressees outside the Qumran community, and therefore seems deliberately to avoid the style reserved for the inner writings of the community. Instead it chooses to use the language employed by Jewish literati at the time. So the case of 4QMMT reinforces rather than discards the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts.

The texts of 4Q252 and 4Q254 present a different case. The two scrolls are copies of a commentary on a selection of passages from Genesis, and include a pesher of Jacob's blessing. This pesher on *Gen* 49:1 mentions the typical sectarian collocation אֲנָשֵׁי הַיְּהָד ("the men of the Yəḥād" in 4Q252 V,5 and 4Q254 4,4). Yet this single occurrence should not outweigh the bulk of the commentary, which does not employ sectarian features. (15) Its author probably drew on non-sectarian oral or written traditions. (16)

of a man's portion in the truth") in 4Q418 172,5, a precise counterpart of the formulation in the *Rule of the Community*: וְכָפִי נִחַלַת אִישׁ בְּאֵמֶת יִצְדָק ("and according to a man's portion in truth he will be made righteous" — *IQS* IV,24).

(14) See my surveys in D. Dimant, "The Qumran Aramaic Texts and the Qumran Community," in A. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *Flores Florentino. The Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (JSJSup 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197-205; eadem, "Themes and Genres in the Aramaic Texts from Qumran," in K. Berthelot and D. Stoekl (eds.), *Aramaica Qumranica: The Aix-en-Provence Colloquium on the Aramaic Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill) (in press).

(15) Several sections of the commentary rewrite the temporal course of the *Genesis* Flood story (*Gen* 7-8) according to the 364-day calendar (4Q252 1 i-ii). However, although adopted by the Qumran community this calendar was espoused by

Be that as it may, the two cases do not challenge or annul the classification of some eight hundred non-biblical Qumran manuscripts. Nor do they efface the distinctive features of the texts explicitly associated with the Qumran community. By and large, the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian works accords well with most, if not all, of the Qumran texts.

The foregoing comments have, I hope, demonstrated the vital importance of the sectarian/non-sectarian distinction in any discussion of the Qumran documents, especially in evaluating lexical and theological aspects of this literature. The need to take this taxonomy into account is illustrated below by three examples.

The “Covenant of the Fathers”

The non-biblical collocation **ברית האבות**, (“the Covenant of the Fathers”) occurs only once in the entire corpus of the Qumran scrolls, namely in the *Damascus Document* VIII,18 (ms. A) and the parallel section of XIX,31 (ms. B). The line in question has not survived in the *Damascus Document* copies from cave 4, so the Geniza manuscripts are the only witnesses to this unusual locution. It reappears in several rabbinic midrashim of later redaction. (17) These data should alert the reader to the special import invested in this expression and in the pertinent section (*CD* VIII,14-18/XIX,26-31 (18)). The closest parallel found in other Qumran documents occurs in a liturgical passage of the *War Scroll* (*IQM* XIII,7): **וברית [כ]רתה לאבותינו**: (“And you [m]ade a covenant with our fathers”). But this formulation takes its cue from *Jeremiah* 31:32 and 34:13, both speaking of Sinai Covenant, whereas the *Damascus Document* passage appears to refer to the covenant with the biblical Patriarchs. A comparison of the sectarian texts with their biblical sources shows the way the Deuteronomistic text is reworked in the *CD* discourse:

CD VIII,14-18(=XIX,26-31)

ואשר אמר משה (19) לא בצדקתך ובישר לבבך אתה בא לרשת את הגוים האלה
כי מאהבתו את אבותך ומשמרו את השבועה וכן המשפט לשבי ישראל, סרי מדרך

other, non-sectarian works, such as the *Astronomical Book* (=1 *Enoch* 72-82). It therefore cannot be considered a sectarian marker.

(16) Cf. M.J. Bernstein, “4Q252: From Re-Written Bible to Biblical Commentary [4QpGen^a],” *JJS* 45 (1994): 1-27.

(17) The collocation appears in the form **ברית אבות**. Cf. e.g. *NumRabba* 20, 15; *Tanḥuma*, *Balak*, 10; *Tanḥuma* (*Buber*), *Re’eh*, 11.

(18) On the place of VIII,14-18 in the literary context of the *Damascus Document* see S. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 27-28, 40 with references to previous literature. Considerations of this nature do not affect the theological analysis of the passage presented below.

(19) The version of ms B in XIX,27 adds here **לישראל**.

העם: באהבת אל את הראשנים אשר היעידו (20) אחריו (21), אהב את הבאים אחריהם כי להם ברית האבות

And as for what Moses said “Not by your righteousness and your uprightness of heart do you come to dispossess these nations, but rather from his love for your fathers and his keeping of the oath” [*Deut* 7:8, 9:5], so is also the judgment for the penitents of Israel, who departed from the way of the people: by God’s love for the first ones, who witnessed after him, he loved those who came after them, for theirs (is) the covenant with the fathers (22). *Deut* 7:7-8

לא מרבכם מכל העמים חשק ה' בכם ויבחר בכם כי אתם המעט מכל העמים: כי מאהבת ה' אתכם ומשמרו את השבעה אשר נשבע לאבותיכם הוציא אתכם ביד חזקה ויפדך מבית עבדים מיד פרעה מלך מצרים.

It is not because you are the most numerous of peoples that the LORD set His heart on you and chose you, for you are the smallest of peoples; but rather from the LORD’s love for you and his keeping of the oath He made to your fathers that the LORD freed you with a mighty hand and rescued you from the house of bondage, from the power of Pharaoh king of Egypt. *Deut* 9:5

לא בצדקתך ובישר לבבך אתה בא לרשת את ארצם כי ברשעת הגוים האלה ה' אלהיך מורישם מפניך ולמען הקם את הדבר אשר נשבע ה' לאבותיך לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב:

Not by your righteousness and your uprightness of heart do you come to possess their country but rather because of the wickedness of those nations the LORD your God is dispossessing those nations before you, and in order to keep the oath that the LORD made to your fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.

The key to the meaning of the Qumranic section is the peculiar character of the combined citation. Though presented as a running quote from Mosaic words the citation opens with the first part of *Deut* 9:5 and continues with the second part of *Deut* 7:8. The citation of the *Damascus Document* thus omits from *Deut* 9:5 the theme of the wickedness of the nations, and from *Deut* 7:8 it drops the references to Israel’s election and to the Exodus. The retained segments of the biblical source affirm that the dispossessing of the nations was due to the divine love for Israel’s fathers and to Gods’ oath to them (23) rather than to Israel’s righteousness. The “covenant of the

(20) The original reading היעידו is corrected to העידו, in keeping with XIX,30 העידו.

(21) Instead of the short אחריו (“after him”) ms B (XIX,29) reads על העם אחרי (“to the people after God”), which makes better sense.

(22) The translation, with slight alterations, is that of J.M. Baumgarten and D.R. Schwartz, “Damascus Document (CD),” in J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents* (The Dead Sea Scrolls 2; Tübingen-Louisville: Mohr Siebeck-John Knox, 1993), 29.

(23) Cf. e.g. *Gen* 15:18; 17:8-9; 35:12; *Ex* 33:1.

fathers” is thus equated with the oath given to the Patriarchs. The main biblical support for the *CD* assertion is *Deut* 7:8, for here the themes of divine love and the oath to the fathers are linked. So the composed citation of the *Damascus Document* stresses that the particular divine favor to the people of Israel is explained by God’s love and by the divine keeping of the oath to Israel’s fathers. Yet the real aim of the sectarian author is additionally imparted through his alteration of the biblical phraseology. For while *Deut* 7:8 speaks of the love of God to the entire people of Israel, a reference still preserved in the ms. B version, (24) the ms. A version, and other omissions effected by the *Damascus Document*, shift the emphasis from God’s love for Israel to His love for “your fathers.” (25) The following interpretation articulates this tendency by stating that just as the divine love was accorded to the “fathers” of Israel, so it is given to “the penitents of Israel” (and not to Israel), namely to the members of the Qumran community. (26) Clearly, the *Damascus Document* is intent on showing that this divine love is granted to the sectaries because they adhere to the “covenant of the fathers,” while their opponents do not. Presenting the circumstances in this way indicates that God’s love is the main concern of the passage from the *Damascus Document*, rather than the covenant itself. This is a major theological tenet particular to the sectarian worldview, aligned with its dualistic thinking. From such a perspective the divine love for the righteous, identical with the sectaries, is contrasted with the divine hate for the wicked, identified with the community’s opponents. Such a dichotomy is present in the passage under discussion (note *CD* VIII,8[=XIX,31] (27), as well as in other sections of the sectarian literature (e.g. *CD* II,2-III,12; *IQS* IV,1-14 (28)). A precise presentation of the term “the covenant of the fathers” should therefore put forward both its unique character and its particular sectarian connotations.

(24) See above n. 19.

(25) Rabin explains the change as “an intentional distortion to fit the exegesis,” but he does not elaborate the point. Cf. C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958²), 35.

(26) Éd. Cothenet already noted the contrast between “Israel” and “the Penitents of Israel.” See *idem*, « Le Document de Damas », in J. Carmignac, Éd. Cothenet et H. Lingée, *Les Textes de Qumran* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1963), tome 2, 177, nn. 24,26.

(27) In *CD* VIII,18b(=XIX,31) the author contrasts the Love of God to “the penitents of Israel” with His hate of the “builders of the barrier.” Since such a contrast fits perfectly well with other dualistic presentations in sectarian texts one may question Hultgren’s contention that VIII,18b is “a gloss.” Cf. *idem*, *The Damascus Covenant* (cf. above n. 18), 27-28.

(28) The recurrence and frequency of the verb אהב in sectarian texts are in themselves remarkable and merit investigation.

The Adjective אביון

The next example concerns the adjective אביון. In the biblical parlance it is always used in the general sense of “poor, destitute.” (29) Some of the sectarian scrolls take up this meaning (cf. e.g. *CD* VI,21; XIV,14; *1QpHab* XII,10; *4Q416* 2 iii 8-12). However, in several other sectarian texts the word is used as an epithet for the Qumran community. This is the sense of the locution עדת האביונים (“the congregation of the poor ones”) in the pesher of *Psalm* 37 (*4Q171* 1-2 ii 9; 1-4 iii 10) or the expression אביוני פדותכה (“The poor ones whom you have redeemed”) in the *War Scroll* (*1QM* XI,9; cf. *4Q491* 11 I 11; *4Q446* 1,5). A parallel collocation is אביוני חסד (“the poor ones of (your) kindness”) used by *Hodayot* (*1QH^a* XIII[V],24). (30) This usage should therefore be discussed separately in the framework of the sectarian worldview and self-image. It is worth checking whether the theological import of the term as a sobriquet for the sectaries has to do with the sectarians’ rejection of “wealth of wickedness” (הון רשעה) and their practice of sharing property and money. (31) Additionally it would be interesting to investigate the distribution and use of אביון in the sectarian sense. Such a presentation would allow discernment of more subtle shades of meaning, for instance, the difference between the use of this term in the sectarian wisdom texts, such as the *4QInstruction*, and in the *pesharim* and *Rules*.

בליעל

The third example illustrates how the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts may change the perspective and understanding of a given term, in this case the word *bly'l* (בליעל). (32) In biblical usage the word appears as a noun, meaning “worthlessness, wickedness, evildoing.” (33) It often stands as the attributive *nomen*

(29) See F. Brown, S.R. Driver and C.A. Briggs, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975[1953]), (= BDB), 2; L. Koehler, W. Baumgartner and J.J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (= HALOT), vol. 1, 5; D.J.A. Clines (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 1993), (= DCH), vol. 1, 104-105.

(30) Translators have understood the *nomen rectum* חסד (“kindness, loyalty”) to apply to the poor ones. However, it may also be understood as referring to the divine.

(31) Such a connection is indeed suggested by G.J. Botterweck, “’ebhyôn,” *TDOT*, vol. 1, 41.

(32) The following comments are based on my detailed analysis in D. Dimant, “Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastema,” in A. Roitman and L. Schiffman (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Proceedings of the International Conference held at the Israel Museum, Jerusalem (July 6-8, 2008)* (Leiden: Brill) (in press).

(33) Cf. BDB, p.117; HALOT, pp. 133-134; DCH, p. 178.

rectum in construct pairs. In this way the locution בְּנֵי בְלִיעֵל (“wicked/worthless people” [literally “people of wickedness/worthlessness”]) describes wicked or worthless people (*I Sam* 1:16). A worthless or wicked thing is expressed as דְּבַר בְּלִיעֵל (“a wicked thing” [literally “a thing of wickedness”]) (*Ps* 41:9), while abstract wickedness is rendered by a locution such as יַעַץ בְּלִיעֵל (“a wicked plotter,” [literally “a plotter of wickedness”]) (*Nah* 1:11). Many Qumran passages take up such biblical idioms in which *bly’l* designates an abstract quality (e.g. *IQH^a* XI[III],29.33; XIV[VI],24), but they also employ it as a proper name. The appearance of *bly’l* as a proper name is indicated by well-defined syntactic markers. It occurs either as a determinate subject of a transitive or active verb, or is connected to nouns through their suffixed possessive pronouns (cf. e.g. *CD* IV,13.18; *4Q174* 4,3; *4Q286* 7 ii 1-2; *11Q13* ii12). In fact, the word is used both as the name of the chief of the evil forces and as the noun describing his activity (e.g. *CD* V,18; *IQM* XIII,2; *4Q286* 7 ii 2; *11Q13* ii 12). But significantly, such usage of *bly’l* is almost exclusively confined to the sectarian texts. Belial is the arch-demon of the sectarian literature, and no other figure shares it with him. (34) Yet looking into non-sectarian texts we find beside Belial another figure, the Angel or Prince of *mštmh* (מִשְׁטָמָה). As is often the case with Qumranic vocabulary the Hebrew noun *mštmh* is drawn from the Hebrew Bible, where it denotes “animosity.” (35) In non-sectarian texts it became the attributive noun of a particular figure, described either as “Angel” or “Prince.” (36) Furthermore, in these non-sectarian texts the Prince, or Angel, of *mštmh* is the chief evil protagonist while Belial is reduced to a subordinate role. Only once does the title Prince of *mštmh* appear in a sectarian text, namely in the *Damascus Document* XVI, 5. However, this fact ties up with other links of the *Damascus Document* with non-sectarian and non-Qumranic traditions. (37) Moreover, this single occurrence serves only to emphasize the predominance of the name Belial in the sectarian texts, in contrast to the pre-eminence of the angel of *mštmh* in non-sectarian texts.

(34) Only once, in the *War Scroll*, do we find an explicit identification of Belial as an evil supernatural being: “You have made Belial to corrupt, an angel (of) *mštmh* (= hostility)” (*IQM* XIII,10-11). In this case the phrase “an angel (of) *mštmh*” stands in apposition to Belial, and thus describes him. So the phrase asserts that Belial is an angel whose chief trait is animosity. It is not used here as a proper name. Cf. the following note.

(35) See HALOT, 640-641; DCH vol. 5, 502-503.

(36) In all the Hebrew occurrences of the word *mštmh*, it stands as an attributive noun, determined by the article. It is never used as a proper name (cf. *CD* XVI,5; *4Q270* 6 ii 18; *4Q271* 4 ii 6; *4Q225* 2 i 9; 2 ii 13,14). It became such a name only in the translations of the *Book of Jubilees* into Greek and Ethiopic, probably because this rare Hebrew word was not understood.

(37) Cf. D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (DJD 30; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 110-112.

The picture of the Prince of *mštmh* emerges from *Jubilees*, *Pseudo-Jubilees* and partly the *Apocryphon of Jeremiah*, all of which may be defined non-sectarian works. (38) In all three, the angel of *mštmh* is the chief character but also Belial is mentioned. The clearest indication of this fact comes from *Pseudo-Jubilees*, where one fragment mentions the two figures side by side (4Q225 2 ii 14). Thus we are presented with a clear distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian texts: the first group promotes almost exclusively Belial as the leader of the evil forces, whereas the second group presents the Prince of *mštmh* in a similar role, and Belial as his subordinate. Without the sectarian–non-sectarian distinction we would be unable to recognize the particular character and role of Belial or his distinct counterpart in the non-sectarian literature.

Incidentally, neither Belial nor the Prince of *mštmh* is mentioned by the Qumran Aramaic texts. These have other names for the demonic figures. This again highlights the literary and ideological differences between the Hebrew and the Aramaic texts found among the Qumran scrolls, a distinction that also should be taken in consideration in every analysis of Qumranic terminology.

Another significant feature, which differentiates the sectarian literature from the non-sectarian Hebrew and Aramaic corpora, is its attitude to external literature. Broadly speaking, the literary products of the Qumran community constitute a self-centered and self-contained universe. Only the Hebrew Bible is explicitly cited and reworked. In other respects the sectarian literature elaborates its own intricate system of inner references. In contrast, the non-sectarian texts display a variety of links to various segments of contemporary Jewish literature and lack the narrow particularity of the sectarian writings.

The above considerations and examples illustrate the importance of keeping in mind the distinct character of the different bodies of literature which constitute the Qumran library, since they differ in style, purpose and terminology. Otherwise, no precise definition of the theological language and framework used by these various constituents is possible.

Devorah DIMANT

(38) The Angel of *mštmh* plays a central role in the *Book of Jubilees* by acting as a satanic figure, but Belial is also mentioned there once (1:20). In the surviving fragments of *Pseudo-Jubilees* the Prince of *mštmh* also figures prominently (4Q225 2 i 9; 2 ii 13,14), yet once Belial is also mentioned. The *Apocryphon of Jeremiah* refers to “the Angels of *mštmwt*” (4Q387 2 iii 4; 4Q390 1,11; 2 i 7), probably subordinate to the Prince of *mštmh*, but Belial is also brought up (4Q390 2 i 4).

“SECTARIAN” AND “NON-SECTARIAN” TEXTS: A POSSIBLE SEMANTIC APPROACH

THE present paper focuses on the debated question of the distinction between the “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts of Qumran. This issue is clearly relevant on both a theological and linguistic (i.e. semantic and lexicographic) level, and as such plays a crucial role in the discussion concerning the theoretical background of the ThWQ. From a theological perspective, distinguishing between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts may result in the identification of peculiar conceptions and reflections which would otherwise remain unobserved or be inconsistently interpreted. From a linguistic perspective, on the one hand, the “sectarian” texts of Qumran should be understood as a *corpus* consisting of those texts which might have been authored by the Qumran (?) Jewish grouping(s) as well as by its/their so-called “parent groups”. On the other hand, the “sectarian” texts reflect a specific use of the language that explicitly aims at conveying the ideology and the *Weltanschauung* (i.e. shared beliefs, moral values, theological elaborations) of the grouping(s) lying behind them. This paper only focuses on the linguistic perspective on this issue.

1. “Sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts of Qumran: the current state of scholarship

1.1 *The DSS as library*

The so called “Qumran Library” consists of a heterogeneous group of about 900 texts. One of the aims of Qumran scholarship has always been to investigate the nature and the provenance of this collection of texts: do they represent a “library” or, rather, merely a random accumulation of texts? According to E. Tov, (1) defining the

(1) E. Tov, “Hebrew Biblical Manuscripts from the Judaean Desert: Their Contribution to Textual Criticism,” *JJS* 9 (1988): 5-37.

Qumran writings as a “library” is merely a semantic question which does not have any influence over the content, nature, and provenance of the scrolls. (2)

About 10 years later, this issue was explored by D. Dimant. (3) Although Dimant agrees with Tov’s prudence about the concept of “library,” she understands the DSS as being composed of “the specific literature produced by the community together with a body of literary works which they took over from their parent groups.” (4) In light of this, one may re-define the concept of library and argue that it actually reflects a concrete relationship between the texts from the 11 caves. As Dimant observes, “all the caves housed segments of one and the same collection.” (5) This tangible relationship between the Qumran writings would attest to an underlying intention: *someone* (a single community? several groupings?) must have played *an active role* in the conception and building of the library.

1.2 The existence of a “scribal school” in the Qumran Library

Tov (6) argues that the authorship of the DSS can be demonstrated in light of morphological criteria. Some of the scrolls would in fact share specific morphological and orthographical patterns which might reflect the presence of a “scribal school.” In the DSS one may identify “two types of orthography and language. One group of texts — probably written in Qumran — is the product of a *scribal school* recognizable by several features, while the other group — of probably imported texts— lacks those characteristics.” (7) According to Tov, moreover, the texts reflecting the Qumran “scribal school” systematically share the following four morphological and physical features:

- (a) Recurrent use of specific scribal marks, e.g. paragraphs marks.
- (b) Use of medial-initial letters in final position.
- (c) Tendency to use palaeographic script for the divine name.
- (d) Quality of the material: Tov highlights a correspondence between the best preserved scrolls and the presence of the features of the “scribal school,” and poses the following question: “Is it a coincidence that the most extensively preserved texts from Qumran, in-

(2) Tov, *ibid.*, 10: “If by ‘library’ is meant all the books which the community owned or stored, without any implication that they used them or agreed with their contents, the employment of that term is not problematic.”

(3) D. Dimant, “The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance,” in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness*, eds. D. Dimant, L.H. Schiffman (STDJ 16; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995), 23-58.

(4) Dimant, *ibid.*, 36.

(5) Dimant, *ibid.*, 31.

(6) Tov, *ibid.*

(7) Tov, *ibid.*, 10.

cluding 11QT^a, the longest surviving scroll, are written in the 'Qumran System'?" (8)

Tov meaningfully calls such scribal features the "Qumran System", and argues that they specifically apply to "the sectarian writings of the Qumran Community." (9) This conclusion was criticized by E. Chazon (10) in 1992 as well as, later, by A. Lange: (11) according to Lange and Chazon, Tov's list of criteria merely implies that a specific group of texts was *copied* in Qumran; the features of the "scribal school" should not act as evidence that the given texts were actually *authored* in Qumran.

A few years later, in 1992, E.G. Chazon tried to apply Tov's criteria to 4Q504 in order to decide whether this text should be considered as a "sectarian" or "non-sectarian" composition. In her paper Chazon shows that the set of criteria isolated by Tov represents a good starting hypothesis, which is, however, not enough to prove the "sectarian" nature of a text. According to Chazon, besides Tov's morphological criteria the quest for the "sectarian" nature of a text should take the further three points into consideration:

- (a) Palaeography: "paleographical dating can be used as a criterion for determining the nonsectarian origin of a Scroll only when the lower limit possible on paleographical grounds sufficiently precedes the date of settlement at Qumran (indicated by the archeological evidence), so as to preclude the writing of that Scroll during the period of the sect's activity there". (12) It should be observed that Chazon tends to identify "sectarian" with "qumranic". One might disagree on this point.
- (b) Identity with a "non-sectarian text": If a scroll "were to be positively identified as a piece of nonsectarian liturgy, then such an identity would constitute a criterion for determining nonsectarian authorship." (13)

(8) Tov, *ibid.*, 13.

(9) Tov, *ibid.*, 13. The existence of ideologically oriented "scribal schools" can still be observed even nowadays. At present, the affiliation to a group may consist in sharing and producing texts which not only convey a specific ideology but also display deliberate morphological peculiarities. Some Italian left wing groupings show a tendency for using the letter "k" instead of "c" in their texts as well as kind of "reversed-n." They thus create a direct association between the content of the message and an eye-catching morphology, so that the ideological provenance of those texts is recognisable by just seeing the texts.

(10) E.G. Chazon, "Is *Divrei ha-me'orot* a sectarian prayer?" in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*, eds. D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (STJD 10; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1992), 3-17, esp. 6ff.

(11) A. Lange, "Kriterien essenischer Texte," in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfinden vom Toten Meer*, eds. J. Frey and H. Stegemann (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 59-69.

(12) Chazon, *ibid.*, 8.

(13) Chazon, *ibid.*, 9.

- (c) Terminology and ideas: Chazon argues that a “sectarian” text should reflect the presence of specific ideological patterns, which may be referred to by a specific lexicon. The researcher should therefore focus on the *content* of the texts, namely on the set of ideas they convey. The presence in a text of “sectarian” ideas *or* terminology may actually attest to a sectarian provenance. Dimant argues against this conclusion, saying that “only the presence of such distinctive terminology defines a given text as belonging to the community. It is therefore meaningless to talk about members of the community authoring documents ‘compatible’ with the community’s ideology but using none of its distinctive terminology.” (14)

1.3 Patterns of a shared ideology in the Qumran Library

The nature of a possible Qumran “sectarian” ideology is hotly disputed. On the one hand, according to Dimant, “it is preferable [...] to see the sects thought as one homogeneous system, though variously reflected by different documents.” (15) This position is supported by other scholars such as for instance I. Fröhlich. (16) On the other hand, there are scholars (A. Lange (17) and C. Hempel (18)) who argue that even the notion of “sectarian ideology” is extremely heterogeneous and fuzzy, so that it should be first and foremost problematised, especially as far as the issue of distinguishing between the so called “Qumran sect” and its “precursors” is concerned. (19)

It is once again Dimant who convincingly systematises the heterogeneous nature of the sectarian ideology within a consistent framework of reference. According to Dimant (20) the sectarian ideology concerns “roughly four major areas: (1) the practices and organization of a particular community, (2) the history of this community and its contemporary circumstances, (3) the theological and metaphysical outlook of the community, and (4) the peculiar biblical exegesis espoused by that community.” According to current scholar-

(14) Dimant, *ibid.*, 28, note 14.

(15) D. Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudoepigraphica, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, ed. M.E. Stone. (Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984), 483-550, here 532.

(16) I. Fröhlich, “From Pseudoepigraphic to Sectarian,” *RevQ* 83 (2004): 395-406.

(17) Lange, *ibid.*

(18) C. Hempel, “Kriterien zur Bestimmung ‘essenischer Verfasserschaft’ von Qumrantexten,” in *Qumran kontrovers: Beiträge zu den Textfunden vom Toten Meer*, eds. J. Frey and H. Stegemann (Paderborn: Bonifatius, 2003), 71-85.

(19) See Hempel, *ibid.*, 77: “Sobald wir damit rechnen dürfen, dass die Qumrantexte den Jachad und dessen Vorläufergruppe bezeugen, wird es unerlässlich, zwischen beiden religiösen Gemeinschaften, deren Selbstbeziehungen und Selbstverständnis zu differenzieren.”

(20) Dimant, *ibid.*, 27f.

ship, one may argue that sectarian ideology generally embraces the following themes:

- (a) Dualistic representation of mankind and of the world.
- (b) Purity/impurity.
- (c) Self-representation of the Community as holy and elect against the background of the corrupt Temple of Jerusalem.
- (d) Foundation of the Community based on a new covenant with God.
- (e) Historical justification of the Community in light of a new interpretation of biblical texts.
- (f) Initiation into secret levels of knowledge.

1.4 *The sectarian vocabulary*

Whether the presence of these ideological patterns solely justifies the “sectarian” nature of a text is questioned by Dimant. She argues that if a text reflects traces of the “sectarian ideology,” this merely means that the given text might have been ideologically relevant for the community (this is the case in several parabiblical and apocryphal texts (21)). Dimant argues that the genuine “sectarian” ideology must also be lexicalised by a specific “sectarian” vocabulary, which explicitly aims at conveying such ideological patterns. With her research Dimant provided a completely new and functional approach to the whole question: the distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts can be argued on a purely lexical basis. In this regard, it is clear that the presence of *both ideology and vocabulary* can act as decisive evidence for the sectarian nature of a text. Starting with this hypothesis, Dimant (22) subdivides the Qumran *corpus* into three groups of texts:

- (a) Biblical Texts.
- (b) CT [Community Terminology] Texts: «a group of scrolls was discerned which employed a distinctive terminology, linked with a peculiar set of ideas». These clusters of terms and ideas encompass the major areas of the sectarian ideology.
- (c) NCT [Non-Community-Terminology] Texts: a group of texts without “sectarian” features.

This list of texts, exhaustively summarised by Campbell, (23) should presently constitute the only available classification of the “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” DSS on the basis of a lexicological analysis. As far as the most studied Qumran Texts are concerned, the

(21) See Fröhlich, *ibid.*

(22) Dimant, *ibid.*, 27-30.

(23) J.G. Campbell, “The Qumran sectarian writings,” in *The Cambridge History of Judaism Volume Three* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 798-821, esp. 802-805).

list may be considered as normative; however, in the case of many other sapiential, liturgical, and poetic texts, the question of whether they belong to a “sectarian” or “non-sectarian” cluster still remains open, and at present cannot rely on an adequate methodology.

2. A possible semantic approach to the issue: some preliminary ideas for a research project

2.1 Foreword

Against the framework of the current state of scholarship, I contend that a decisive contribution to this debate can be provided by a lexical-semantic approach. In my view Dimant’s lexical results should be considered as the lexical starting point for developing a semantic methodology aimed at finding formal linguistic criteria which allow for a consistent distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts to be made. This coincides with the aim of a research project which I am undertaking within the framework of the ThWQ. In this section of the paper I intend to refer to the hypothesis, thesis, and methodology of this research project. First of all, the following preliminary specifications must be made:

- (a) The term “sectarian” by no means refers to a concrete “sect” (e.g. the Essenes); rather, it belongs to an established technical terminology and refers to the possible presence of groupings which might have authored part of the DSS.
- (b) The distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts is only *prima facie* a quest for the provenance and the origin of the scrolls. The labels “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” should be merely considered as formal linguistic categories referring to two patterns of lexical organisation which recurrently apply to two distinct groups of writings.
- (c) As a linguistic category, the label “sectarian” does not have any direct connection with the location “Qumran” at all, nor should it be considered as being synonymous with “Qumran”. From a theoretical point of view, a “pre-qumranic” (24) work or even a text from Massada could be “sectarian”, if it happens to share the lexical features which apply to the “sectarian” texts.
- (d) The language of the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) is regarded as a *corpus*-based language, which scholarship also calls Qumran Hebrew (QH). QH is typologically close to Late Biblical Hebrew (LBH).

(24) This might be the case of the *Treatise on the Two Spirits*. Cf. e.g. A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination* (STDJ 18; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995), esp. 121-170.

2.2 Research methodology

2.2.1 Hypothesis and thesis

The starting hypothesis of the research project is based on the main conclusions of the current state of research in the field, and consists in the following assumptions:

- (a) At least some of the DSS reflect peculiar ideological aspects.
- (b) Such ideological aspects are not random; rather, they respond to recurrent patterns which reflect a set of shared beliefs belonging to one (or more) Jewish grouping(s).
- (c) Such shared beliefs are conveyed by a specific vocabulary. The particular features of the sectarian vocabulary seldom consist in neologisms; rather, the semantic innovation results in transposing already existing biblical (viz. “non-sectarian”) words onto completely new semantic coordinates.
- (d) In a text, the presence of a specific ideology *supported by* a specific vocabulary clearly attests to the “sectarian” provenance of the text itself.

In light of the hypothesis expressed by points (a)-(d), the thesis of the project is as follows: the “sectarian” nature of single texts (or groups of texts) can be proved on a formal and linguistic basis, namely with the aid of a semantic analysis aimed at identifying and categorising recurrent patterns of lexical organisation which may attest to a “sectarian” use of the language. Testing, developing, and discussing valid criteria to undertake this analysis is the aim of this research project.

2.2.2 General methodological framework: *Componential Analysis of Meaning*

The methodological benchmark of the project corresponds to the semantic theory known as Componential Analysis of Meaning (CA) which I successfully applied to Ancient Hebrew (AH) in my doctoral dissertation (*The Semantic Field of the substantives of “gift” in Ancient Hebrew*). (25) In this paragraph I intend to focus on two

(25) The elaboration of theoretical principles and procedure of CA can be traced back to the main works of Eugenio Coseriu. As far as a concrete application of CA to AH is concerned one may refer to many publications and works undertaken at the University of Florence, see e.g. P. Fronzaroli, “Componential Analysis,” *ZAH* 6 (1993): 79-91; A. Vivian, *I campi lessicali della “separazione” nell’ebraico Biblico, di Qumran e della Mishna, ovvero applicabilità della teoria dei campi lessicali all’ebraico* (Quaderni di Semitistica 4; Firenze, 1978); F. Zanella, “Could Componential Analysis be more than a heuristic tool?” *KUSATU* 6/1 (2006): 113-137; I. Zatelli, *Il campo lessicale degli aggettivi di purità in Ebraico Biblico* (Quaderni di Semitistica 7; Firenze, 1978); *ead.* “Functional Languages and their Importance to the Semantics of Ancient Hebrew,” in *Studies in Ancient Hebrew*, ed. T. Muraoka (Louvain: Peeters, 1995), 55-63; *ead.* “The Study of Ancient Hebrew

essential notions of CA, namely the concept of “meaning” and the concept of “Functional Language”.

The *meaning* of a word results from the sum and the interaction of single semantic features (semes). The semes are deducible through the identification of semantic oppositions (paradigmatic relations) between the semantic values of a group of lexemes. Meaning is thus not an *a priori* feature of a given word; rather, it corresponds to the product of the dynamic interactions of a specific lexeme with its lexical background. The linguistic system comprising a net of semantic relations between a small or large group of lexemes is known as “Lexical Field” (LF).

To provide homogeneous linguistic data, the oppositions between the lexemes must be identified and analysed within homogeneous linguistic areas which are known as *Functional Languages*. A Functional Language is a linguistic unit that is uniform from the point of view of time (synchrony), space (i.e. dialects), social function, and style. As far as the AH corpus is concerned, 12 different Functional Languages have been identified. (26) The application of the notion of Functional Languages to the semantic study of a language such as AH results in simultaneously providing particular and homogeneous (synchronic) results, together with a wider and cross-sectional (diachronic) overview of the whole *corpus*. It is possible, for instance, to analyse the structure of a LF in each Functional Language, and at the same time to compare the organisation of the LF according to specific Functional Languages, in order to detect traces of diachronic, dialectal, and stylistic peculiarities and/or developments.

2.2.3 CA and Qumran Hebrew: the “Sectarian Language of Qumran”

In my view, the application of CA to assist in distinguishing between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts can play a relevant heuristic role. In the methodological framework of CA, one should understand the specific language reflected by the “sectarian” texts (at least by those texts which current scholarship regards as “sectarian”) as a Functional Language *per se*, namely, the “Sectarian Language of Qumran”. The identification of such a Functional Language entails relevant sociological implications. From a sociolinguistic point of view, only the “Sectarian Language of Qumran” — not the whole *corpus* of the DSS (as W.M. Schniedewind suggests (27)) — should be “appreciated only by reference to its social function within the Qumran community.” (28) Only the “Sectarian Language of Qumran”

Lexicon. Application of the concepts of Lexical Field and Functional Language,” *KUSATU* 5 (2004): 129-159.

(26) Zatelli, “Study,” 140-142.

(27) W.M. Schniedewind, “Qumran Hebrew as an Antilanguage,” *JBL* 118 (1999): 235-252, here p. 235.

(28) Schniedewind, *ibid.*, 235.

again, should be considered as an “anti-language,” namely a language “created by conscious linguistic choices intended to set the speakers and their language apart from others.” (29)

2.3. *Concrete procedures*

2.3.1 Isolating a *corpus ad hoc*

The preliminary phase of this research project consists in isolating a specific *corpus* of texts and lexical samples which should be subsequently divided into three clusters, namely:

- (a) “Sectarian” texts.
- (b) “Non-sectarian” texts.
- (c) Uncertain texts, i.e. texts to be assessed and about which scholarly consensus has not yet been attained (e.g. sapiential and poetic-liturgical texts).

Groups (a) and (b) shall function as control groups. The “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” nature of those texts shall not be discussed, since it refers to the results of Dimant’s research. This issue has already reached scholarly consensus. The focus of the analysis is on the group of uncertain texts, since no scholarly agreement about their “sectarian” or “non-sectarian” nature has been reached as of yet. The purpose of the research consists in providing objective, repeatable, and formal criteria with which to assess the uncertain texts.

2.3.2 Isolating lexical samples

The next step consists in the selection of a vocabulary sample which shall subsequently be analysed according to the three groups of texts. Also for this phase of research I shall necessarily refer to Dimant’s results. It is important to point out that this lexical selection should not be arbitrary; rather, it must constitute a lexical sample which should adequately represent the main aspects of “sectarian” ideology. Against the framework of current scholarship, the following LFs have been chosen:

- (a) Purity/impurity
- (b) Knowledge
- (c) Truth
- (d) Prayer – praise, speech acts
- (e) Possession
- (f) Terms for “community”
- (g) Expulsion, exclusion, relegation.

From a methodological perspective, it is important to observe that the choice of texts and the choice of lexical samples should

(29) Schniedewind, *ibid.*, 235.

constitute two independent processes. The texts should not be isolated according to the presence (or absence) of the selected LFs, whereas the choice of the LFs should not be influenced *a priori* by the terminology of the selected texts.

The distribution of the selected vocabulary within the three textual clusters already constitutes a relevant piece of evidence. One might expect the distribution of the seven LFs (linked to the “sectarian” ideology) to vary remarkably according to the “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” nature of the selected texts.

2.3.3 The Semantic Analysis: the identification of formal criteria

Once the *corpus* of texts and the LFs have been isolated, the semantic analysis can begin, with the aim of identifying testable semantic criteria to act as formal guiding principles for an assessment of the uncertain texts. At this stage of the research a decisive heuristic role is played by the two control groups (i.e. “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts): they provide the necessary formal elements for identifying two different patterns of lexical organisation which will be considered as paradigms of the “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” language-uses. By “patterns of lexical organisation” I simply mean explicit and well identifiable models of semantic opposition recurrently applying to the meanings of the members of the selected LFs.

The semantic analysis per se shall be subdivided into three steps. The first step consists in the study of each LF within both control groups in order to isolate a “sectarian” and a “non-sectarian” lexical paradigm. The second step consists in the study of the configurations of the LFs within the group of uncertain texts in order to compare them with the paradigms applying to groups (a) and (b). The formal linguistic criteria will eventually enable the researcher to categorise most of the texts of group (c) as either “sectarian” or “non-sectarian.” It is important to point out that the whole procedure is solely based on linguistic evidence, namely on the configuration of the LFs according to the three groups of texts. Such formal semantic elements will represent the decisive (and only) heuristic tool for studying the relations between the uncertain texts and the texts in the control groups. To sum up, the methodological framework of CA will enable the whole procedure to remain on one and the same linguistic plan.

2.3.4. New insights into the notion of “sectarian”

Furthermore, I anticipate that this kind of analysis shall provide new insights into the still fuzzy notion of “sectarian” texts. If (as seems plausible) the Qumran writings reflect a heterogeneous constellation of several groupings, then it must be possible to study this heterogeneity on the basis of specific lexical features (e.g. word uses, neologisms). With the aid of CA it shall be possible to identify even within the Sectarian Language of Qumran different sub-languages

(jargons) which may attest to the presence of different groupings, namely the “parent groups” of the Qumran community which recent scholarship mentions.

3. Some examples

During the revision of my doctoral dissertation I re-analysed the whole set of Qumran data in light of the hypotheses and thesis of the present research proposal. The results are quite encouraging. In the last part of the paper I intend to refer to two relevant examples from my dissertation. The first example refers to the substantive תְּרוּמָה: the linguistic investigation of the lexeme תְּרוּמָה clearly attests to the presence of specific patterns of lexical organisation which exclusively apply to “sectarian” texts. The lexeme תְּרוּמָה is not an exception: within the LF of the substantives of “gift”, similar results apply for other relevant lexemes such as מִנְחָה, מִנְחָה, נֶדֶר, and שְׁלוֹם. The second example refers to the configuration of the LF of the substantives of “gift” in the “sectarian” texts of Qumran.

3.1 The lexeme תְּרוּמָה

In the “sectarian” texts of Qumran the substantive תְּרוּמָה attests to a use which occurs nowhere else in the AH *corpus*: in these texts the lexeme can be used with reference to a “contribution of prayer” and to a “contribution of knowledge”. This specific use of תְּרוּמָה corresponds to — and results from — a specific pattern of syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations which is unknown to both the biblical and to the “non-sectarian” texts. The following tables display the main semantic coordinates of תְּרוּמָה in (a) in the cultic text of the Bible, (b) the cultic, “non-sectarian”, texts of Qumran (mostly Temple Scroll), and (c) the “sectarian” texts of Qumran.

The Lexeme תְּרוּמָה in the Cultic Texts of the Bible		
Syntactic Role	Syntagmatic Relations	References
Direct Object	רום (hiph. “to remove, to separate”)	<i>Num</i> 15:19; 18:26.28a; <i>Ez</i> 45:13; 48:8.9.20b
	נתן (“to give”)	<i>Ex</i> 30:14.15; <i>Num</i> 15:21; 19:19.28b; 31:29
	לקח (“to take”)	<i>Ex</i> 25:2ab.3
	בוא (hiph. “to bring”)	<i>Deut</i> 12:6.11
	אכל (“to eat”)	<i>Deut</i> 12:17
Nomen Regens	תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה (“the תְּרוּמָה of YHWH”)	<i>Ex</i> 30:14.15; <i>Num</i> 18:26. 28ab.29; 31:29. 41

	תְּרוּמַת הַקֹּדֶשִׁים (“the תְּרוּמָה of the holy hings”)	<i>Lev 22:12; Num 18:19</i>
	תְּרוּמַת־הָרֶגֶל (“the תְּרוּמָה of the threshing floor”)	<i>Num 15:20</i>
	תְּרוּמַת מִתָּנָם (“the תְּרוּמָה of their מִתָּנָם”)	<i>Num 18:11</i>
	תְּרוּמַת יָד (“the תְּרוּמָה of a hand”)	<i>Deut 12:6.11.17</i>
	תְּרוּמַת כָּל מִכֹּל תְּרוּמוֹתֶיכֶם (“the תְּרוּמָה of anything from all your תְּרוּמוֹת”)	<i>Ez 44:30</i>
	תְּרוּמַת הַקֹּדֶשׁ (“the תְּרוּמָה of the holy place”)	<i>Ez 45:6.7; 48:10. 18ab. 20b.21ac</i>
	תְּרוּמַת הָאָרֶץ (“the תְּרוּמָה of the land”)	<i>Ez 48:12</i>
Nomen Rectum	שֹׁק הַתְּרוּמָה (“the shoulder of the תְּרוּמָה”, hence “the removed shoulder”)	<i>Ex 29:27; Lev 7:34; 10: 14.15; Num 6:20</i>
	זָהָב הַתְּרוּמָה (“the gold of the תְּרוּמָה”, hence the removed gold”)	<i>Num 31:52</i>
	מִכְס תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה (“the computation of the תְּרוּמָה of YHWH”)	<i>Num 31:41</i>
	מִשְׁמֶרֶת תְּרוּמָתִי (“the control of my תְּרוּמוֹת”)	<i>Num 18:8</i>
Apposition	תְּרוּמָה	<i>Ex 29:28c</i>
	קָרְבָּן (“generic offering to God”)	<i>Lev 7:14</i>
	שֹׁק (“shoulder”)	<i>Lev 7:32</i>
	חֻלֵּה (“cake”)	<i>Num 15:20b</i>
	מַעֲשֵׂר (“tithe”)	<i>Num 18:24</i>
Further relevant Syntagmatic relations		References
	תְּרוּמָה לַכֹּהֵן (“the תְּרוּמָה for/of the priest”)	<i>Lev 7:32</i>
	תְּרוּמוֹתָם לַיהוָה (“their תְּרוּמָה for/to YHWH”)	<i>Ex 29:28c; Num 15:19. 21</i>
	הַתְּרוּמָה הַזֹּאת לַנָּשִׂיא (“this תְּרוּמָה for the prince”)	<i>Ez 45:16</i>
	תְּרוּמַת יְהוָה לְאַהֲרֹן הַכֹּהֵן (“the תְּרוּמָה of YHWH for Aaron the priest”)	<i>Num 18:28b</i>
	תְּרוּמָה לְכָל־קֹדֶשׁ בְּנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל ²³³ (“a תְּרוּמָה among all consecrated things of the sons of Israel”)	<i>Num 5:9</i>
	תְּרוּמָה מִתְּרוּמַת הָאָרֶץ (“the תְּרוּמָה from the תְּרוּמָה of the land”)	<i>Ez 48:12</i>

A quick look at the table enables one to observe not only that תְּרוּמָה occurs together with lexical items belonging to the sacrificial lexicon, but also that the substantive itself should be understood as a

typical lexical item of the sacrificial lexicon. The lexeme denotes a huge transaction of selected goods intended for the Temple, for the priests, and for God. An analogous use of the lexeme is found in the Juridical-Cultic texts of Qumran, as the following table shows.

The Lexeme תְּרוּמָה in the Cultic Qumran Texts		
Syntactic Role	Syntagmatic Relations	References
Direct Object	רום (hiph. “to remove, to separate”)	11Q19 XX:14
Prepositional Object	היה (“to be”) + כ	4Q251 10:9
	שים (“to put”) + עם	11Q19 XV:11; 11Q20 I:18
Nomen Rectum	שוק התרומה (“the shoulder of the תְּרוּמָה”)	11Q19 XV:11; 11Q20 I:18; V 10i,11:1
	מכס תרומתמה (“the calculation of the תְּרוּמָה”)	4Q524 6-13:9; 11Q19 LX:4
Apposition	החזה שוק הימין ואת נהלחיים ואת הקב) [254]ח252 ואת האזרוע ואת תְּרוּמָה (“the right shoulder and the breast and the cheeks and the maw and the foreleg”)	11Q19 XX:14
Further relevant Syntagmatic relations		References
תרומתמה לעוף ולחיה ולדגים אחד מאלף (“your תְּרוּמָה for the birds and the beast and the fish, one of a thousand”)		11Q19 LX:4

Many lexical relations of תְּרוּמָה occurring in the cultic biblical texts can also be found in the cultic language of Qumran. It is therefore possible to observe a consistency in the use of the substantive between the two groups of texts. In this regard, it is crucial to point out that the sacrificial use of the substantive also applies to narrative, poetic, and sapiential texts both of the biblical and of the Qumran (I would add “non-sectarian”) *corpus*. One may thus understand the reference to a cultic contribution represents as a constant semantic feature of תְּרוּמָה, which is *independent* of the “genre” of the texts in which the lexeme occurs.

According to the main thesis and the theoretical framework discussed in this paper, the researcher should now ask himself/herself whether the “sectarian” texts might attest to a use of the lexeme תְּרוּמָה which is at variance with the data resulting from the biblical and “non-sectarian” texts. I am happy to say that the lexeme תְּרוּמָה provides a positive answer to this question. The following table refers to the main lexical relations qualifying the use of the lexeme תְּרוּמָה in texts which current Qumran scholarship regards as “sectarian”.

The Lexeme תְּרוּמָה in the “Sectarian” Texts of Qumran		
Syntactic Role	Syntagmatic Relations	References
Prepositional Object	בֶּרֶךְ (pi. “to bless”) + ב (understood)	<i>IQS</i> X:6.14; <i>4Q256</i> XIX:4
	אָכַל (hiph. “to feed”) + מִן	<i>4Q513</i> 2ii3
Nomen Regens	תְּרוּמָה of lips (“תְּרוּמַת שִׁפְתִּים”)	<i>IQS</i> IX:4; X:6; <i>4Q256</i> XIX:4
	תְּרוּמָה of an utterance (“תְּרוּמַת מוֹל שִׁפְתִּי”)	<i>4Q511</i> 63–64ii4
	תְּרוּמָה of that, which comes out from my lips (“תְּרוּמַת מוֹצֵא שִׁפְתִּי”)	<i>IQS</i> X:14
	תְּרוּמָה of the tongue (“תְּרוּמַת לְשׁוֹן”)	<i>4Q400</i> 2:7; <i>4Q403</i> 1ii26; <i>4Q405</i> 23ii12
Further relevant Syntagmatic relations		References
דַּעַת (“knowledge”)		<i>4Q400</i> 2:7; <i>4Q405</i> 23ii12; <i>4Q511</i> 63–64ii4
רוֹי דַּעַת (“mysteries of knowledge”)		<i>4Q403</i> 1ii26
בִּינָה (“comprehension”)		<i>4Q405</i> 23ii12
שִׁכֹּל (“understanding”)		<i>4Q405</i> 23ii12
צַדִּיק (“righteousness”)		<i>4Q511</i> 63–64ii44
בִּגְן מְלֹאכִי (“angelic portion”)		<i>4Q513</i> 2ii3
עֲלוֹת וְחֵלְבֵי זִבְחִים וְתְרוּמוֹת וְנֹדֶבֶת שִׁפְתִּים (“burnt offerings and the fat parts of your sacrifices and the תְּרוּמָה and a spontaneous offering of lips”)		<i>4Q258</i> VII:5

According to this table, the “sectarian” texts of Qumran actually attest to a striking modification of the whole semantic background of the substantive תְּרוּמָה: the typical lexical relations with the sacrificial lexicon — even if not missing (30) — are massively substituted by relations with lexical items referring to “speech acts” (i.e. praise and prayer), righteousness, and knowledge. These relations even build genitival syntagms which nowhere else occur (תְּרוּמַת מוֹל שִׁפְתִּי; תְּרוּמַת שִׁפְתִּים, מוֹצֵא שִׁפְתִּי etc.). These (syntagmatic and paradigmatic) lexical relations attest to two new meanings of the lexeme תְּרוּמָה, namely “contribution of prayer” and “contribution of knowledge.”

To conclude: the new meanings of תְּרוּמָה constitute a good and valid example of a “sectarian” idiolect. Moreover, these results can

(30) Cf. *IQM* IV:1; *4Q258* VII:5; *4Q267* 6:3; *4Q270* 3ii14.18.19; *4Q496* 16:4; *4Q513* 2ii3.

ideally be used as a measuring criterion for the assessment of uncertain texts. The identification of this specific use of תְּרוּמָה in manuscripts belonging to the cluster of “uncertain texts” would definitely speak for the “sectarian” nature of the given manuscripts.

3.2 *The configuration of the LF of gift in the “sectarian” texts of Qumran*

The final example concerns the peculiar configuration of the LF of the substantives of “gift” in the “sectarian” texts. The relevance of this second example consists in showing that the “Sectarian Language of Qumran” attests to idiosyncratic patterns of lexical organisation which not only apply to single lexemes (such as תְּרוּמָה) but which may even involve a group of words.

My doctoral dissertation identifies four recurrent patterns of oppositional sense-relations between the meanings of the gift-lexemes across all linguistic strata of AH: the semantic oppositions can be grounded indeed on (a) the purpose of the gift, (b) the function of the gift, (c) the modality of the gift, and (d) the effects of the gift.

Opposition patterns	Remarks
Purpose of the gift	This opposition identifies lexemes that are specifically distinguished according to the aim of a particular kind of gift.
Function of the gift	This opposition involves contexts, donors, and recipients of a specific gift. In the cultic texts the opposition concerns the “technical” cultic function of the gift-giving.
Modality of the gift	This kind of opposition is typical of the cultic dimension. The “modality” of presentation of a gift/offering refers to the specific reference to (a) the part of the day, in which the gift should be presented, (b) the quantity/quality of the goods offered, and (c) the actual way in which the gift/offering happens to be presented.
Effects of the gift	This opposition relates to the concrete effects of the gift on the recipient. Gifts referring to the inner human condition, such as wellbeing, satisfaction, and enjoyment of life, are understood as concrete gifts.

By re-analysing the configuration of the LF of “gift” in the Qumran *corpus* I discovered that the “Sectarian Language of Qumran” reflects an opposition pattern which nowhere else occurs, namely a semantic opposition grounded on the *abstract function of the gift*.

LF of “gift”: peculiar opposition pattern in the Sectarian Language of Qumran	
Abstract Function of the gift	This opposition involves a group of four lexical units (מִנְחָה “offering of praise”, מִנְחָה, “offering of a prayer”, תְּרוּמָה “contribution of knowledge”, and תְּרוּמָה “contribution of prayer”) which are distinguished according to the abstract function of the lexicalised offerings: such lexemes, in fact, refer to acts of praise and knowledge which actually take the place of the material presentation of offerings, thereby having an abstract or symbolic function.

This kind of opposition pattern is particularly linked to a central “sectarian” ideological issue, namely the (substitutive?) relation between prayer and sacrifice. Only if such data were consistently identified and subsequently analysed and understood as being typical features of the “sectarian” texts, they could even constitute a concrete and innovative impulse for further theological reflection.

Conclusions

After providing an overview of the state of contemporary scholarship on the issue of the distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” Qumran texts, the paper went on to focus on a possible lexical-semantic approach to this subject, which can be summarised as follows: semantically, both “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” texts reflect two different uses of the language, which can be consistently identified by a specific linguistic investigation and used as an objective paradigm for the assessment of a group of uncertain and disputed texts. The paper provided two preliminary examples of this kind of analysis which emerged out of the study of the LF of the substantives of “gift” in AH, and which prove that the “sectarian” texts of Qumran actually attest to specific semantic features which are not found elsewhere in the AH corpus. The first example (the new meanings of the lexeme תְּרוּמָה) involves a single lexeme, whereas the second (the opposition pattern grounded on the “abstract function of the gift”) corresponds to a more complex linguistic structure which applies to four lexemes. These results represent a valid example of a typically “sectarian” pattern of lexical organisation, which can be used as a valid criterion for the assessment of uncertain texts.

Francesco ZANELLA

SATANIC VERSES

The Adversary in the Qumran Manuscripts and Elsewhere

CURRENTLY two dictionary projects are dedicated to the texts from the Qumran library. The first one is the “Qumran Wörterbuch” which Karl-Georg Kuhn and Hartmut Stegemann founded. After a long period of stagnation it proceeds now under the direction of Reinhard Gregor Kratz in Göttingen. Intended to be a philological dictionary, the Göttingen project wants to close the gap between the dictionaries of Biblical and Rabbinic Hebrew and Aramaic.

“Das Hauptziel des Unternehmens besteht in der Erarbeitung eines philologischen Wörterbuchs, das den gesamten Wortschatz der nicht-biblischen Texte vom Toten Meer erfasst und das Material etymologisch, morphologisch sowie semantisch aufbereitet. Das Wörterbuch schließt damit die bisher kaum erforschte Lücke zwischen dem älteren biblischen und dem jüngeren rabbinischen Hebräisch und Aramäisch.” (1)

The second dictionary project dedicated to the Dead Sea Scrolls is the “Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumranschriften (ThWQ)”, which is directed by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Dahmen. The ThWQ is the successor of the famous “Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament” and wants to address the marginal treatment of the Dead Sea Scrolls in this reference work. Based on a thorough semantic analysis, the editors hope to produce a tool which allows for a better theological understanding of ancient Jewish literature from Graeco-Roman times.

In conclusion, the ThWQ will be an invaluable resource for the comprehension of the history of — and the development of — ideas within the

(1) <http://www.qwb.adw-goettingen.gwdg.de/index.html> (February, 16th 2009).

intertestamental period in view of still not canonised Old Testament and the of the early Jewish literature on the one side, and of the conflict between the Early Judaism, the Hellenism and the Early Christianity on the other side. (2)

Both projects address the lexicographic need created by the publication of the Dead Sea Scrolls and both projects want to focus exclusively on the Dead Sea Scrolls. This distinguishes the Göttingen Qumran Wörterbuch and the ThWQ from a third dictionary project currently undertaken, i.e. the “Dictionary of Classical Hebrew (DCH)” edited by David J.A. Clines. (3) The DCH also aims at a comprehensive treatment of the Dead Sea Scrolls but only as a part of all pre-Rabbinic Hebrew texts. All three dictionaries address a pressing lexicographic need in the study of pre-Rabbinic Hebrew and pre-Rabbinic Hebrew literature and are more than welcome.

In case of the Aramaic texts from Qumran, the situation is significantly better because Klaus Beyer compiled a glossary to his edition of the Aramaic texts from Qumran which equals a full fledged Aramaic dictionary to the Dead Sea Scrolls. (4) Beyer’s approach to the lexicographic task posed by the Dead Sea Scrolls is comparable to Clines’ *DCH* because he recognizes all pre-Rabbinic Jewish Aramaic texts.

The comparison between the aims of the Göttingen *Qumran-Wörterbuch* and the *ThWQ* on the one hand and the *DCH* and Beyer’s glossaries on the other hand, pose the question of how the Dead Sea Scrolls can best be studied lexicographically. Is it feasible to produce a dictionary which focuses exclusively on the texts of the Qumran library or is it more appropriate to include the Dead Sea Scrolls in an overall Hebrew/Aramaic dictionary of pre-Rabbinic Jewish literature?

(2) http://www.uni-bonn.de/en/www/ThWQ/Research_Objective.html (February, 16th 2009).

(3) D.J.A. Clines (ed.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 1-5 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993-2001), idem, *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*, vol. 6ff. (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press, 2007ff.).

(4) K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 500-763; idem, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register, Ergänzungsband* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1994), 302-450; idem, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten: aramaistische Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Deutung, Grammatik/Wörterbuch, deutsch-aramäische Wortliste, Register, Band 2* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 340-528.

By way of the example of the Hebrew noun שטן, I will try to answer this question. For this purpose I will begin with some principal reflections in how far the Dead Sea Scrolls represent a linguistic corpus. Afterwards I will study the lexeme שטן in the Dead Sea Scrolls only. In a third part, I will redo this analysis by way of including non-Qumranic evidence. At the end of my paper I will give some conclusions.

1. The Dead Sea Scrolls as a Linguistic Corpus?

The group of texts which are called the Dead Sea Scrolls today were found at various sites in the Judean Desert. Each site dates to a different time and is connected with a different social group or groups. The earliest Dead Sea Scrolls were written in the 4th cent. B.C.E. in Aramaic and were found in Wadi ed Daliyeh. They were brought to Wadi ed Daliyeh by refugees from Samaria when Alexander the Great conquered Coele-Syria. (5) Not considering Khirbet Mird, the latest Dead Sea Scrolls date to the Second Jewish War and come mostly from Naḥal Ḥever and Wadi Murabba'at. This means the Dead Sea Scrolls cover a period of about 500 years. Furthermore the Dead Sea Scrolls are written in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, Nabatean, and Latin. Hence, the Dead Sea Scrolls from the various sites in the Judean desert have only their regional affiliation in common but cannot be viewed as any corpus of texts, linguistic or otherwise.

Should a Dead Sea Scrolls dictionary thus restrict itself to the Qumran library? Is the Qumran library a linguistic corpus? In its composition, the Qumran library can best be compared with Ancient Near Eastern temple libraries as it includes a diversity of literary and non-literary texts. (6) The variety of languages observed before can also be found inside the Qumran library itself. The Qumran library includes texts written in Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and depending on how 4Q235 and 4Q343 are interpreted also in Nabatean. Furthermore, the rejection of Brontology in the *Book of Watchers* and the attestation of a brontological omenlist in 4QZodiacology and Brontology shows that the Qumran texts derive from different backgrounds and milieus. Even disregarding the Biblical manuscripts, the earliest texts found at Qumran were composed in Persian times while the latest were written in Roman times. Examples for Persian time texts include in 4QInstruction-like Composition

(5) For the manuscripts from Wadi Ed-Daliyeh and their history, see now J. Dušek, *Les manuscrits araméens du Wadi Daliyeh et la Samarie vers 450-332 av. J.-C.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 25; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

(6) Cf. A. Lange, "The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls—Library or Manuscript Corpus?" in *From 4QMMT to Resurrection: Mélanges qumraniens en hommage à Émile Puech* (eds. F. García Martínez, A. Steudel, and E. Tigchelaar; STDJ 61; Leiden and Boston, Mass.: Brill, 2006), 177-93.

B (7) and the early layers of the *Book of Watchers*. (8) An example for a text composed in Roman times would be the final stage of the *War Rule* as attested by *IQM*. If we include the biblical manuscripts from Qumran the chronological range of the Qumran collection would widen more significantly. As the Dead Sea Scrolls in general, the texts, which were collected in the Qumran library, cannot be regarded as a linguistic corpus. They represent neither the literature of one group nor do they all come from one period of ancient Judaism. On the contrary, the Qumran library is a chance collection of Second Temple Jewish literature and if the so-called biblical manuscripts are included the texts collected in the Qumran library reach back even into the Iron Age. Without further research it is difficult to say if all Qumran texts were authored in Judea but such a regional focus might not be unlikely.

To summarize: Neither the Dead Sea Scrolls in general nor the Qumran manuscripts in particular are a linguistic corpus in terms of language, group affiliation, or date. But all the manuscripts from the Judean Desert in general, and the Qumran scrolls in particular might come from the same region. The Dead Sea Scrolls can be conceived as a corpus only in this regional sense. This regional corpus would be an incomplete one though as other texts from same region — such as the *Book of Similitudes* — are not preserved in the Qumran library.

2. שטן in the Dead Sea Scrolls

In the Hebrew manuscripts from Qumran, the term שטן occurs in *IQSb* 1,8; *IQH^a* 4,6; 45,3; *4QDibHam^a* (4Q504) 1-2 iv 12 and *11QPs^a* XIX:15. In the Aramaic literature from Qumran, שטן occurs only in *ALD* 3:9. *IQSb* 1,8; *IQH^a* 4,6; 45,3 are too damaged for linguistic analysis. Although in the case of the *Hodayot* the new edition of *IQH^a* prepared by Carol Newsom, Eileen Schuller and Hartmut Stegemann (9) might provide a better text.

In *4QDibHam^a* XVII:13-14 (1-2 iv 12-13) שטן occurs in a quotation of *IKgs* 5:18. (10) Here Solomon describes his successes in the following way: “But now the LORD my God has given me respite all

(7) A. Lange, “The Pre-Maccabean Literature from the Qumran Library and the Hebrew Bible,” *DSD* 13 (2006): 276-305, esp. 293-95.

(8) A. Lange, “‘Your Daughters Do Not Give to Their Sons and Their Daughters Do Not Take for Your Sons’ (Ezra 9,12): Intermarriage in Ezra 9-10 and in the Pre-Maccabean Dead Sea Scrolls,” *BN* 137 (2008): 17-39; *BN* 139 (2008): 79-98.

(9) C. Newsom, E. Schuller, and H. Stegemann, *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a: With Incorporation of 4QHodayot^{a-f} and 1QHodayot^b* (DJD 40; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2008). This edition was not available to me when writing this article.

(10) For the quotation of *IKgs* 5:18, cf. M. Baillet, *Qumrân Grotte 4.III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 145; and the forthcoming edition of E. Chazon (STDJ), which is quoted here according to D.W. Parry and E. Tov (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, vol. 5: *Poetic and Liturgical Texts*

around; there is no adversary (ואין שטן) and no mischance.” (11) Because of this situation Solomon decides to build the Jerusalem temple. In *Dibrei HaMe’orot*, this description of the bliss of Solomon’s reign is turned into an expression of eschatological hope.

And all the nations have seen Your glory — inasmuch as You have displayed Your majesty in the midst of Your people Israel, for the sake of your great name — and they shall bring their offerings: silver, gold and gems, even every precious thing of their lands, whereby to glorify Your people and Zion, Your holy city, as well as Your glorious temple, “there is neither adversary nor misfortune” (ואין שטן ופגע רע). (12)

IKgs 5:18 becomes part of an eschatological description of the pilgrimage of the nations to Mt. Zion. In this time of eschatological bliss, there is neither adversary nor mischance but only peace and blessing. In *4QDibHam^a* XVII:14 (1-2 iv 13), the noun שטן designates thus eschatological adversaries of Israel. The indeterminate use of the noun in the phrase ואין שטן “there is no satan” shows that in the understanding of *Dibrei HaMe’orot* שטן is not a proper name but a designation of a category of demons which will no longer exist in the eschaton.

There are two further references to שטן in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls, i.e. *11QPs^a* XIX:15 — a part of the so-called Plea for Deliverance — and the *Aramaic Levi Document* 3:9. (13)

ואל תשלט בי כל און

And let not any iniquity have power over me (*Ps* 119:133).

[ואל תשלט בי כל שטן [לאטעני מן ארחך]

And let not any satan have power over me to make me stray from your path (*ALD* 3:9 [*ALD* suppl. 10; *ALD* 1a,10; *4QLevi^b* 1,17]) (14)

και μη κατισχυσατω με πας σατανας πλανησαι με απο της οδου σου

(Leiden: Brill, 2005), 253. The counting is according to Chazon; the numbers in parenthesis reflect the counting of the *editio princeps*.

(11) Translations according to the *The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text*.

(12) Translation and transcription according to Chazon in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader*, vol. 5, 252-53.

(13) For the use of שטן in these texts, see A. Lange, “The Significance of the Pre-Maccabean Literature from the Qumran Library for the Understanding of the Hebrew Bible: Intermarriage in Ezra/Nehemiah — Satan in 1 Chr. 21:1 — the Date of Psalm 119,” in *Congress Volume Ljubljana 2007* (ed. A. Lemaire; VTSuppl; Leiden/Boston: Brill), forthcoming.

(14) I follow the counting of the edition of J.C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone, and E. Eshel, *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP 19; Leiden: Brill, 2004). The counting of alternate editions and manuscripts is given in parenthesis. Translation and transcription according to Greenfield/Stone/Eshel, 60-61.

אל תשלט בי שטן ורוח טמאה

Let neither a satan nor a spirit of impurity have power over me (*11QPs^a* XIX:15).

The intertextual relationship of the three texts can be determined by the use of the word שטן. A common dependence of the *ALD* 3:9 and *11QPs^a* XIX:15 on *Ps* 119:133b seems unlikely, (15) because is highly improbable that both texts would have substitute the און of *Ps* 119:133 with the rare word שטן independent from each other. Furthermore in the preserved text of the *ALD* שטן occurs only in *ALD* 3:9. It seems highly unlikely that both the *Plea for Deliverance* and the *ALD* would independently use the rare noun שטן. Therefore, one text is influenced by the other. The Hebraism in the *ALD* argues for the *Plea for Deliverance* depending on *Psalms* 119 and the *ALD* depending in turn on the *Plea for Deliverance*.

11QPs^a XIX:15 uses the term שטן without a determinative and mentions it in parallel with another type of demon, the spirit of impurity (רוח טמאה). (16) The parallelism between “a satan” and “a spirit of impurity” shows that satan refers to a type or class of demons in the *Plea for Deliverance* and not to the leader of the antidivine world. (17)

In its quote of *Ps* 119:133, the *ALD* speaks of כל שטן. The all inclusive particle כל shows that the *ALD* conceives not only one Satan who would be the leader of the antidivine world but a whole group of satans. — The use of כל could also show that the *ALD* readjusts the quote of the *Plea for Deliverance* to the text of *Ps* 119. — In the *ALD*, the noun שטן is not a proper name but a designation of a class or type of bad demons. Both the *ALD* and the *Plea for Deliverance* show that in late Persian and early Hellenistic times the noun שטן can be a generic term which designates a category of demonic beings.

In the Qumran library, not only the attestations of the noun שטן are of interest but also its absence in some Dead Sea Scrolls. In

(15) Contra D. Flusser, “Qumran and Jewish ‘Apotropaic’ Prayers,” *IEJ* 16 (1966): 194-205, 196-97; R.A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL 9; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996), 73.

(16) For the concept of a demonic spirit of impurity in ancient Judaism, see A. Lange, “Considerations Concerning the ‘Spirit of Impurity’ in Zech 13:2,” in *Die Dämonen/Demons: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt/The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment* (eds. A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger, and K.F.D. Römhelt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 254-68.

(17) Cf. Flusser, 197; M. Stone and J. Greenfield, “The Prayer of Levi,” *JBL* 112 (1993): 247-66, 262-64; Greenfield/Stone/Eshel, 129-30; H. Drawnel, *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document* (JSJSuppl 86; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 216. Contra Nielsen, 751, who wants to understand שטן in *11QPs^a* XIX:15 as a proper name (interestingly enough Nielsen does not mention *ALD* 3:9).

Ps 109:6, the MT mentions a שטן with the function of a legal accuser or prosecutor. This text is also reflected in the LXX translation of δίαβολος.

But *4QPs^f* VI:3 reads a masc. part. of the verb שטן instead, ושוטן “and the one who accuses”. The *4QPs^f*-reading could of course be a question of different vocalizations and *matres lectiones*. But the Septuagint reading of δίαβολος shows that the MT pronunciation goes back to antiquity because in *Ps* 109:20.29 the Septuagint renders participles of the verb שטן with forms of the Greek word ενδιαβάλλω. Furthermore, *4QPs^f* VI:1 reads in *Ps* 109:4 יסטמוני instead of the Masoretic ישתנוני, i.e. a form of the root סטם instead of a form of the root שטן. It looks as if *4QPs^f* tries to avoid systematically the noun שטן or forms of the root שטן. If possible, *4QPs^f* substitutes the verbal forms of שטן with the root סטם. But because the name Mastemah derives from the root סטם, it cannot do so for the noun שטן which it changes hence to the participle שוטן.

The paratext *4QpsJub^a* (4Q225) 2 i-ii, instead, combines the story of the sacrifice of Isaac with heavenly scenes from the introduction to the Book of *Job*. But in *Pseudo-Jubilees* it is not the שטן but prince Mastemah (המסטמה שר *4QpsJub^a* 2 i 9; ii 6-7.13) who convinces God to test his loyal servant Abraham by ordering the sacrifice of Isaak. The title prince (שר) as well as the mention of angels in *4QpsJub^a* 2 ii 6, which are subordinate to Mastemah, shows that *Pseudo-Jubilees* envisions Mastemah as the leader of the antidivine forces.

So far my study has reached the isolated conclusion that the noun שטן designates a category of demonic beings in ancient Jewish literature from Hellenistic times and that some texts try to avoid the term שטן entirely. Can more insights be gained by including non-Qumranic texts as well?

3. שטן in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Elsewhere (18)

The earliest references to the noun שטן (19) can be found in dtr History (*ISam* 29:4; *2Sam* 19:23; *IKgs* 5:18; 11:14.23.25). Here it

(18) Recently several high quality studies on the use of the root שטן and the determined שטן in the Hebrew Bible were published. In this brief article, the presentation of the references to שטן in the Hebrew Bible is hence more a survey than an in depth study. For a more detailed treatment see e.g., G. Wanke, “שטן *sātān* Widersacher”, *THAT* 2 (1976): cols. 821-23; P.L. Day, *An Adversary in Heaven: sātān in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM 43; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1988); K. Nielsen, שטן *satan*”, *ThWAT* 7 (1993): cols. 745-51; H.-J. Fabry, “‘Satan’ — Begriff und Wirklichkeit: Untersuchungen zur Dämonologie der alttestamentlichen Weisheitsliteratur”, in *Die Dämonen — Demons: Die Dämonologie der israelitisch-jüdischen und frühchristlichen Literatur im Kontext ihrer Umwelt — The Demonology of Israelite-Jewish and Early Christian Literature in Context of their Environment* (eds. A. Lange, H. Lichtenberger and K.F.D. Römhelt; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 267-91.

(19) The etymological origins of the word שטן are difficult if not impossible to

designates a human adversary — often in battle — without supernatural connotations. A good example is *ISam* 29:4 where his Philistine comrades perceive David as a possible adversary (שׂטן) in battle during his tenure as a Philistine mercenary. Late reflections of this use of שׂטן can be found in *IMacc* 1:36 and *Sir* 21:27. *IMacc* 1:36 describes a fortress as an adversary, a διάβολος. The word διάβολος might go back at this place to שׂטן in the Hebrew original of *IMaccabees*.

Then they fortified the city of David with a great strong wall and strong towers, and it became their citadel. And they stationed there a sinful people, lawless men. These strengthened their position; they stored up arms and food, and collecting the spoils of Jerusalem they stored them there, and became a great snare. It became an ambush against the sanctuary, an evil adversary (διάβολος) of Israel continually. (*IMacc* 1:33-36) (20)

Sir 21:27 speaks about cursing the adversary.

When the godless curses the adversary (τόν σατανάν), he really curses himself (21)

Ben Sira claims that a curse will not apply to the cursed adversary but will fall back on the curser. (22) The text is preserved only in Greek. That the grandson did not render the Hebrew שׂטן but transcribed it instead as τόν σατανάν points to his lack of understanding for non-supernatural connotation of the noun שׂטן. This means, that at the end of the 2nd cent. B.C.E. the noun שׂטן had different implications than in the time of the grandfather (see below).

Ps 109:6 shows that שׂטן was also used more specifically to designate a legal adversary in court, probably a type of prosecutor. (23)

Appoint a wicked man over him; may an accuser (שׂטן) stand at his right side; may he be tried and convicted; may he be judged and found guilty. (*Ps* 109:6-7) (24)

determine and are hence not part of this study. Most scholars believe that the noun שׂטן derives from the verb שׂטן (for a detailed discussion, see Day, *Adversary*, 18-23), but a possible Egyptian (M. Görg, “Der ‘Satan’ – der Vollstrecker Gottes?” *BN* 82 [1996]: 9-12) or even Greek background are discussed as well (D.E. Gershenson, “The Name Satan,” *ZAW* 114 [2002]: 443-45).

(20) Translation according to RSV.

(21) Translation according to P.W. Skehan and A.A. di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1987), 305.

(22) Cf. Skehan and di Lella, 311-12.

(23) Cf. H.-J. Kraus, *Psalmen 60-150* (6th ed.; BKAT 15.2; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1989), 922.

(24) Translations according to the *The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text*.

This use of שטן is confirmed by *Ezra* 4:6 where the noun שטנה signifies an accusation.

And in the reign of Ahsuerus, at the start of his reign, they drew up an accusation against the inhabitants of Judah and Jerusalem. (*Ezra* 4:6) (25)

It is in this line of thought, that השטן (with a determinative) was used in *Job* 1:6-9.12; 2:1-4.6-7 and *Zech* 3:1-2. (26) In these texts, השטן designates an angelic being which functions as a heavenly prosecutor and accuser and which tests human beings through hardship. The determinative shows that a specific angel is referred to as “the accuser” and not a group of angels. A similar understanding of השטן might be reflected in the Greek translation of *Eccl.* 21:27 (see above).

A late Persian time insertion into the book of *Numbers*, i.e. the story of Balaam and his donkey in *Numbers* 22:22-35, (27) describes an unspecified angel of the lord as a שטן — an opponent — of Balaam (*Num* 22:22.32). This use of שטן points to the possibility of a more functional understanding of the angelic satan. In Persian time Jewish myth, any angel could be a שטן, i.e. an adversary. (28)

Out of this more “democratic” Persian time use of the noun שטן a new mythical understanding of the noun שטן developed. As shown above, in the *Aramaic Levi Document* (ALD) and the *Plea for Deliverance* שטן describes a category of negative supernatural beings.

If non-Qumranic evidence is considered it becomes apparent that this use of שטן is widespread in Jewish text from the last three cent. B.C.E. In its indeterminate use of the שטן *1Chron* 21:1 compares well with *1IQPs^a* XIX:15 and *ALD* 3:9. *1Chron* 21:1 describes how a satan incited David to count his people which led to a catastrophic punishment. (29)

(25) Translations according to the *The New JPS Translation According to the Traditional Hebrew Text*.

(26) Thus first G. von Rad, “B. Die at.liche Satansvorstellung,” *TWNT* 2 (1935): 71-74, esp. 72, cf. Day, *Adversary*, 69-126. For the debate about שטן in the Book of *Job* and the Book of *Zechariah*, see also F. Kreuzer, “Der Antagonist: Der Satan in der Hebräischen Bibel – eine bekannte Größe,” *Bib* 86 (2005): 536-44.

(27) For *Num.* 22:22-35 as a late Persian or early Hellenistic insertion into the Bileam story, see Day, *Adversary*, 45-69; A. Lange, *Vom prophetischen Wort zur prophetischen Tradition: Studien zur Traditions- und Redaktionsgeschichte innerprophetischer Konflikte in der Hebräischen Bibel* (FAT 34; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 40-42.

(28) For this understanding of שטן in *Num* 22:22.32, cf. C. Breytenbach and P.L. Day, “Satan,” in *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (eds. K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P.W. van der Horst; 2nd ed.; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 726-32, esp. 727.

(29) For this interpretation of *1Chron* 21:1 see Lange, “Significance,” forthcoming; cf. also the remarks by H. Duhm, *Die bösen Geister im Alten Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1904), 61. T.H. Gaster, “Satan,” *IDB* 4 (1962): 224-28, esp. 225; Stone and Greenfield, 263-64; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel, 130.

A satan stood up against Israel, and incited David to count Israel.
(1Chron 21:1)

Even Rabbinic texts (cf. e.g. *Gen. Rab.* xix) and magic bowls from late antiquity attest to the idea of a demonic category of satans.

Devils, afflictions, satans, bans, tormentors, spirits of barrenness, spirits of abortion, sorcerers, vows (Bowl 15:5)
God (?) from every satan and every trouble (Bowl 22:4) (30)

In the 1st cent. B.C.E., the Enochic *Book of Similitudes* (1En 37-71) mentions a group of demons which it calls satans. (31) The satans will be expelled and are not allowed to come into the presence of the Lord of the Spirits (1En 40:7). That these satans would otherwise accuse the people who live on the earth is a reminiscence to the heavenly accuser attested in the books of *Job* and *Zechariah*. In the *Book of Similitudes* satans are also associated with the fallen angels. While the fallen angels taught secrets the satans taught violence (1En 65:6).

And the fourth voice I heard driving away the satans, and he did not let them come before the Lord of Spirits, to accuse those who dwell on the earth. (1En 40:7) (32)

A command has gone forth from the presence of the Lord against the inhabitants of the earth, that their end is accomplished, for they have learned all the secrets of the angels, and all the violence of the satans... (1En 65:6) (33)

But the *Book of Similitudes* uses the word satan also in the singular. In light of the *Book of Similitudes* to satans in the plural, this singular form of the noun שטן should not be understood as the name of the prince of the antidivine world (34) but as a characterization of such a figure as the principal adversary of God.

For I saw all the angels of punishment dwelling (there) and preparing all the instruments of the adversary. (1En 53:3) (35)

(30) Translations according to J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Magic Spells and Formulae: Aramaic Incantations for Late Antiquity* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press and Hebrew University, 1993), 115.131. Cf. also P. Schäfer and S. Shaked, *Magische Texte aus der Kairoer Geniza*, vol. 1 (TSAJ 42; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), 222 line 34.

(31) Cf. already Flusser, 197 n. 16.

(32) Translation according to G.W.E. Nickelsburg and J.C. VanderKam, *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary* (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress 2004), 54.

(33) Translation according to Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 84.

(34) Thus e.g. H. Haag, *Teufelsglaube* (Tübingen: Katzman Verlag, 1974), 226.

(35) Translation according to Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 67. Nickelsburg and VanderKam translate "Satan" which I substituted with "the adversary."

And Michael and Raphael and Gabriel and Phanuel will take hold of them on that great day, and throw them on that day into the burning furnace, that the Lord of Spirits may take vengeance on them, for their unrighteousness in becoming servants of the adversary, and leading astray those who dwell on the earth. (*1En* 54:6). (36)

In its use of the singular form שטן as a description of the principal adversary of God, the *Book of Similitudes* is comparable to the *Book of Jubilees*. In *Jubilees* the leader of the antidivine world is called Mastemah. (37) Nevertheless, *Jub* 10:7-14 seems to use the designation Satan for Mastemah. (38) *Jub* 10:7-14 describes how Mastemah asks God not to destroy all giants who survived the flood as demonic spirits but to leave some of them to become his subjects. Therefore, the angels of God bind nine tenths of all demons but leave one tenth free. *Jub* 10:11 states: "All of the evil ones, who were cruel, we bound in the place of judgment, but a tenth of them we let remain so that they might be subject to *satan* upon the earth". (39) Clearly, שטן and Mastemah are identical in this text. To me, the most plausible explanation is that *Jubilees* used שטן as a descriptive term, which was misunderstood by the Greek and the Ethiopic translations. Mastemah is described as a שטן, i.e. as the principle adversary or enemy. A better translation of *Jub* 10:11 would thus be "but a tenth of them we let remain so that they might be subject to the adversary upon the earth." This is confirmed by other more general uses of the noun שטן in the *Book of Jubilees* in descriptions of the eschaton (*Jub* 23:29; 50:5) or proleptical anticipations of it (*Jub* 40:9; 46:2). In these references the Greek and Ethiopic translation misunderstood שטן to be a proper name. In light of *Jub* 10:11, שטן should be understood as a generic description of Mastemah in *Jub* 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5 as well. He is the principal adversary:

... and there will be no adversary and no evil (one) who will destroy (*Jub* 23:29)

And the kingdom of the Pharaoh was upright. And there was no adversary and no evil. (*Jub* 40:9)

And there was no adversary or anything evil in the days of the life of Joseph which he lived after his father, Jacob, because all the Egyptians

(36) Translation according to Nickelsburg and VanderKam, 68. Nickelsburg and VanderKam translate "Satan" which I substituted with "the adversary."

(37) For a comprehensive analysis of the figure of Mastemah in ancient Jewish literature, see D. Dimant, "Between Qumran Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts: The Case of Belial and Mastemah," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Contemporary Culture: Celebrating 60 Years of Discovery* (eds. A. Roitman and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming). Deborah Dimant generously provided me with a preprint copy of her article, for which I am grateful.

(38) None of the references to שטן in *Jubilees* are preserved in Hebrew.

(39) Translation according to O.S. Wintermute, "Jubilees (Second Century B.C.)," in *OTP* 2 (1985): 35-142, esp. 76 (italics A.L.).

were honoring the children of Israel all the days of the life of Joseph. (*Jub* 46:2)

And then it will not have any adversary or any evil (one). (*Jub* 50:5) (40)

Jub 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5 allude to *IKgs* 5:18. That Mastemah is not mentioned by name but described as the principal adversary, i.e. as a שטן, is due to *Jubilees'* rephrasing of *IKgs* 5:18. *Jub* 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5 read *IKgs* 5:18 eschatologically. According to *IKgs* 5:18, Solomon had "no adversary and no mischance" (אין שטן ואין פגע רע) and was thus able to build the temple. *Jub* 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; 50:5 alter the text of *IKgs* 5:18. Instead of אין פגע רע ("no mischance") *Jubilees* reads אין רע ("no evil one"). What was described as a time without enemy and mishap in *IKgs* 5:18 becomes in *Jubilees* a time without the principal adversary and the evil one, i.e. without Mastemah. Like during the eschatological prolepsis, when the Solomonic temple was built, there was no adversary or evil one in the time of Joseph and there will be no adversary or evil one in the eschaton itself.

A similar eschatological reading of *IKgs* 5:18 is preserved in *4QDibHam^a* XVII:13-14 (1-2 iv 12-13). For *Dibrei HaMe'orot* the time with neither adversary nor misfortune is the time when the nations will make pilgrimage to Mt. Zion (see above). Different from *Jubilees*, *Dibrei HaMe'orot* does not alter the text of *IKgs* 5:18. Hence, for *Dibrei HaMe'orot* the eschaton is characterized by the absence of enemies and misfortune, not by the absence of Mastemah as the principal adversary. (41) In its understanding of the noun שטן, *Dibrei HaMe'orot* is thus closer to *IKgs* 5:18 than *Jub* 23:29; 40:9; 46:2; and 50:5 are.

How much Jewish authors understood the word שטן as the designation of a demonic species, can be seen in the various substitutes for this noun in ancient Jewish texts. As explained above, *4QPs^d* consciously avoids the use of the noun word שטן in favor of the participle שוטר. Although *4QpsJub^a* incorporates *Job* 1-2 into its paratext on *Gen* 22, *4QpsJub^a* 2 i 9; 2 ii 6-7, 13 substitute the השטן of *Job* 1-2 with the phrase Prince of Mastemah. In the *Book of Jubilees* a paratext to *Gen* 22:1-19 can be found which is very similar to this passage from *Pseudo-Jubilees*. As in *Pseudo-Jubilees*, *Jub* 17:15-18:16 combines the sacrifice Isaac with the heavenly scenes from *Job* 1-2, too. And as in *Pseudo-Jubilees*, the figure which was called השטן in the *Book Job* is called Prince Mastemah in the *Book of Jubilees*. This is all the more interesting because *Jubilees* does attest to the idea of demonic satans (see above, p. 45).

(40) Translations according to Wintermute, 102.130.137.142. Wintermute translates "Satan," which I have replaced with "adversary."

(41) Cf. Nielsen, 751.

It might also be worth mentioning that Pseudo-Philo speaks in his retelling of *Num* 22: 22-35 only of an angel but not of an adversary (*LAB* 18:9). The *LAB* deletes hence the term שטן out of its Pentateuchal basetext.

The best explanation for the various substitutions of the noun שטן in *4QPs*^d, the *Book of Jubilees*, *Pseudo-Jubilees*, and the *LAB* is that for these texts שטן designates neither the prince of evil, nor a human adversary, nor the heavenly accuser but a category of demonic beings which are called satans.

Only in Jewish literature from the late 1st cent. B.C.E. or the 1st and 2nd cent. C.E. the word שטן seems to become a proper name which designates the prince of evil (*L.A.E.* 17:1; *T. Levi* 2:10; *T. Dan* 3:6; 5:6; 6:1; *T. Gad* 4:7; *T. Ash.* 6:4; *T. Job* 3:6; 4:4; 6:4; 7:1, 6, 12; 16:2; 20:1; 23:1, 3, 11; 27:1, 6; 41:5; (42) *Mart. Isa.* 1:9, 11; 2:2 [Greek 3:2]; 2:7). But none of the texts in question is preserved in Hebrew or Aramaic and for several of them specialists assume more or less significant Christian reworking. Nevertheless these texts show that Jewish myth could understand Satan as the prince of evil in the 1st cent. C.E. A good example is *T. Job* 4:3-5 for which Job's suffering is the consequence of his destruction of a temple of idol worshippers, which the *T. Job* also describes as Satan's place. Because he destroyed Satan's temple, Job suffers from Satan's retaliations.

And he said again: "Thus says the Lord: If you attempt to purge the place of Satan, he will rise up against you with wrath for battle. But he will be unable to bring death upon you. He will bring on you many plagues, he will take away for himself your goods, he will carry off your children". (43)

4. Conclusions

The Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls are not an isolated corpus but a chance collection of Jewish literature from different periods of Jewish writing. Only the recognition of both biblical and non-biblical references from Qumran and elsewhere allows to fully understand how the idea of Satan developed in Second Temple Judaism. The earliest references to Satan can be found in the Deuteronomistic History. Here the noun שטן describes a human adversary. In this sense, the noun שטן also refers to a legal opponent in court, a prosecutor (cf. *Ps* 109:6 etc.). Postexilic literature from the Persian period (*Job*

(42) For a comparison between the *satan* in the narrative framework of the Book of *Job*, and Satan in the *Testament of Job*, see C.T. Begg, "Comparing Characters: The Book of Job and the *Testament of Job*," in *The Book of Job* (ed. W.A.M. Beuken; BETL 114; Leuven: Peeters, 1994), 435-45, esp. 438-40.

(43) Translation according to R.P. Spittler, "Testament of Job: A New Translation and Introduction," *OTP* 1 (1983): 829-68, esp. 841.

1-2 and *Zech* 3:1-2) demonstrates that such an adversary or prosecutor was imagined to have existed as part of the angelic host as well. While in *Job* 1-2 and *Zech* 3:1-2 this heavenly *Satan* is understood as one particular angel, *Num* 22:22, 32 show that the role of the adversary could go to any angel in Second Temple Jewish myth. Out of this more “democratic” idea of angelic satans evolved the understanding of שטן as a category of demonic beings as attested in the *Plea for Deliverance*, the *ALD*, *1Chron* 21:1; *Dibrei HaMe’orot*, *Jubilees*, and the *Book of Similitudes*. Only in the 1st cent. C.E. or slightly earlier Jewish texts began to use the word *Satan* as a proper name of the prince of evil. It is this idea of *Satan* as the prince of evil, which becomes dominant in early Christian literature. Rabbinic literature on the other hand and other texts from late ancient Judaism attest to multiple satans (*Magic Bowls* 15:5; 22:4; *Gen. Rab.* xix). Only in later Rabbinic literature the concept of a single *satan* as the head of the antidivine world becomes more popular (cf. e.g. *b.Ber.* 46b). (44)

As for the question of which lexicographic approach to the Dead Sea Scrolls is more appropriate, my study points to a need to include all of ancient Jewish literature. Necessary are a philological and a theological dictionary of Second Temple Hebrew and Aramaic because the Dead Sea Scrolls can be best described as a non-representative medley of this literature. These dictionaries should include non-literary Hebrew texts such as inscriptions and legal documents as well.

Armin LANGE

(44) For further Rabbinic references, see J. Jacobs and L. Blau, “*Satan*,” <http://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/view.jsp?artid=270&letter=S>.

WOMEN IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS: SOME OBSERVATIONS FROM A DICTIONARY

THE issue of women and the Dead Sea Scrolls has been approached from many different perspectives. When the *Rule of the Community* from cave 1 was read in the early 1950s it was the absence of women that was immediately noticed, and indeed this became a major factor in identifying the community that was being described in this document with the Essenes described by Josephus, Philo and Pliny who did not marry and lived, in Pliny's words, "without women ... with only the palm trees for company" (*Nat Hist* 5.73). (1) But women made their appearance as other documents were published over the years (especially in the *Rule of the Congregation* and the so-called "Rituel de Mariage" 4Q502); the *Cairo Damascus Document*, whatever its relationship was to other rules, spoke of women, marriage and family life; and some female skeletons were recovered from the cemetery. All of this was, for the most part, slotted into the existing paradigm of a male celibate community, with some provision made for "another order" (*War* 2.160) for the propagation of the human race. The strains and stresses of holding everything together was felt more strongly after the publication of the *Temple Scroll* and as scholars gradually became aware of the still-unpublished cave 4 copies of the *Damascus Document* and other halakhic materials with regulations about women. But at the various celebrations and conferences held in 1997 to mark the fiftieth anniversary of the discovery of the scrolls, "women" were still not a

(1) Within the context of this article, it is necessary and appropriate to give only a very brief outline of the development of research on women in the scrolls. The reader is referred to the standard surveys and overviews, especially the recent one of S. White Crawford, "Not According to Rule: Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Qumran," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S. M. Paul et al.; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 127–50.

topic of major concern, (2) though an essay was commissioned for the second of the Jubilee volumes edited by VanderKam and Flint (1999). (3) In the last decade, there has been a steady stream of publications, general survey articles, a major panel at the Society of Biblical Literature in 2000, (4) and a panel in a regular session in addition to a session for the general public at the sixtieth anniversary conference in Jerusalem in July 2008. (5) In addition to the detailed study of texts that mention women specifically, more explicit attention is now being paid to the methodological and theoretical issues of reading with a feminist hermeneutic. (6) Furthermore, there has been ongoing discussion of what contribution can be made by archaeology, focused on establishing the number of skeletons of women have been excavated from the cemetery and the presence of “gendered articles” associated with women. (7)

The project of undertaking a theological dictionary offers the opportunity to bring to bear still another perspective. Although I had written various survey and overview articles on women in the past years, (8) when I was asked to write the article on אשה for *ThWQ*, I was forced to experiment with a “word-orientated” approach rather than the “ideas” orientation that had come naturally in previous articles. (9) Although I lack any specialized training in lexicography, and thus I am working only at the most amateur of levels, this new

(2) There are no papers or significant discussion in the SBL volume *The Dead Sea Scrolls at Fifty: Proceedings of the 1997 Society of Biblical Literature Section Meetings*, (ed. R. A. Kugler and E. M. Schuller; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1999); although there is a section (III.6) in the published volume “Women at Qumran,” at the congress itself these papers were simply part of a general section on Themes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery: Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: IES and Shrine of the Book, 2000), 755–760.

(3) E. Schuller, “Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. W. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999): II, 117–44.

(4) Most of the papers, with a brief introduction by R. Kugler and E. Chazon, were published in *DSD* 11 (2004).

(5) Many of these papers will be published in the Proceedings, edited by L. Schiffman and A. Roitman, currently in preparation.

(6) Especially in the work of M. Grossman; see “Reading for Gender in the Damascus Document,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 212–39.

(7) For a survey of much of the current discussion, see J. Magness, “Women at Qumran?” in *What Athens Has to Do with Jerusalem: Essays on Classical, Jewish and Early Christian Art and Archaeology in Honor of Gideon Foerster* (ed. L. V. Rutgers; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 89–123.

(8) In addition to the article mentioned in note 3, see the chapter on “Women” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: What Have We Learned* (Louisville/London: SCM/Westminster/John Knox, 2006), 80–104; with C. Wasser, “Women,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 2. 981–984.

(9) This terminology “word-oriented” versus “ideas- orientated” is taken from Ulrich Dahmen’s Introduction, see above p. 4.

challenge highlighted certain observations, put others in a slightly different light, and generated some new questions. A few of these I will discuss in this short article.

The word that is used most frequently for females in the Dead Sea Scrolls, **אשה** in Hebrew and **אנתה** in Aramaic, is the generic word throughout the Hebrew Bible. In certain contexts and set word combinations (e.g. **לִקַּח אִשָּׁה**) it is used when speaking of a woman who is the sexual partner of a man, and hence often translated as “wife.” Although in Biblical Hebrew, **אשה** is used occasionally for female animals (*Gen* 7:2, and in a distributive sense in *Isa* 34:15, 16 and *Zech* 11:9), it never refers to animals of the female sex in the scrolls. There is one occurrence of **אנתה** in the distributive sense to refer to an inanimate object, in *1QJobTargum* 36,2 = *Job* 41:9, with reference to the scales of Behemoth (which are taken as masculine in MT, but feminine in the Qumran Targum).

(a) The Number of Occurrences

I am working with a count of 109 occurrences of **אשה** and 48 occurrences of **אנתה** in the non-biblical scrolls. (10) Although in approximately one-fifth of these occurrences (just over thirty places) one or more of the letters are reconstructed or are marked by the editors with an open circle, in almost every case the reading/reconstruction is undisputed (usually because it is established by the context or, in the case of *Jubilees*, by the Ethiopic translation (11)). There is one place of significance where the correct reading is disputed, and here

(10) I have worked from the printed version of the *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* by M. Abegg et al. (Leiden: Brill, 2003). Where there are discrepancies between a reading in the *Concordance* and the reading given in the *editio princeps*, in keeping with the policy of *ThWQ*, I have followed the *DJD* editor (hence, I do not include Abegg’s listing of **אנתה** in *4Q550b* 2). I added to the count four Aramaic occurrences from *DJD* volumes that the *Concordance* does not include: *4Q203* 8 7, *4Q213a* 3–4 3, *4Q570* 9 2, *4Q586* 1 2 (admittedly, in *4Q203* 8 7, I am not following Stuckenbruck’s *DJD* text exactly, since he includes **נשיכון** only in the Notes on the Readings and in the translation, but not in the transcription, *DJD* XXXVI, 28–31). For the one place where I have not followed the *DJD*, see the discussion below of *4Q397* 14–21 4.

In two places, *4Q417* 1 i 8–9 and *4Q502* 24 2b, it has sometimes been proposed to read **אשה** and translate as “woman,” but both passages are very problematic and I have not accepted this interpretation in either case. For *4Q417* 1 i 8–9, see the discussion of A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 59–66; also B. G. Wold, *Women, Men and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musa la-Mevin and Its Allusions to the Genesis Creation Traditions* (WUNT 201; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 208–10.

(11) Of course, there are varying degrees of certainty for the restorations. One example of a less certain reconstruction is **אנתה** in *4Q381* 1 7; for a discussion of alternatives, see E. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* (HSS 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 82–3.

I have departed from the decision of the *DJD* editor, namely, in the reconstruction in *4QMMT* Section C, line 4 (=4Q397 14–21 4); E. Qimron reconstructed ועל הנשיאם “and concerning the wom[en]” as the heading of a section of halakhic regulations; it seems better to me to reconstruct ועל נשיא “and concerning the Prin[ce]” — and so this passage is removed from the count. (12) Perhaps it should be noted that in a few of the texts, the word נשים/אשה is clear but there is no context at all so little or nothing can be said about how it is used (e.g., 4Q178 7 1; 4Q398 5 4; 4Q426 1 i 14; 4Q502 309 1; 4Q506 131–132 3; (13) 4Q514 1 i 1).

Many of the occurrences of אשה are in explicit quotations from the Hebrew Bible (e.g., *CD* V,2 quotes *Deut* 17:17 “he should not multiply wives to himself”) or in legal regulations that are reworking specific biblical verses (e.g., the *Temple Scroll*), or in other types of rewriting and close allusion to specific biblical texts (especially in *Revised Pentateuch*, *Jubilees*). In roughly a third of the total occurrences, the passage containing אשה is an exact or nearly exact quotation of a biblical verse, that is, the appearance of the word אשה is fixed by the source text.

(b) Distribution

The distribution of attestations is worthy of comment. The largest number of occurrences of אשה in a single document is in the *Temple Scroll* where it is used in twenty-five distinct passages (twenty-four times in *11Q19* and three times in *4Q524*). The second highest concentration is in the *Damascus Document*, in nineteen distinct passages (ten in *CD* and fourteen in *4QD* copies). אשה occurs ten times in other collections of regulations (*4Q159*, *4Q251*, *4Q265*, *4Q274*, *4Q398*, *4Q514*). To this can be added two passages in the *Rule of the Congregation* (*1QSa* I,4; *1QSa* I,10 = *4Q249e* 1i–3 8a) and one passage in the *War Scroll* (*1QM* VII,3 = *4Q491* 1–3 6). That is, over half of the occurrences are in rules and collections of halakhic regulations.

(12) The decision about the correct restoration is rendered more complex because there is not agreement about the reconstruction of the manuscript at this point. Qimron (*DJD* X) put frg. 4Q397 14–21 at the beginning of the reconstructed Section C; both H. Stegemann and J. Strugnell would put another fragment 4Q398 11–13 first and then after a gap would come 4Q397 14–21. In this arrangement, where there has already been discussion of past kings and blessings and curses, it is more likely that the heading refers to “the Prince” rather than “the women.”

(13) Although there is no immediate context for]אשה[, the subsequent lines of the fragment overlap with 4Q504 4 2–7 which comes in col. V of the reconstructed scroll of 4Q504 and thus it can be established that this mention of “woman” is part of the daily prayer for Sunday (for the ordering of the fragments and columns according to the reconstruction of E. Chazon, see the presentation in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Reader* (ed. D. W. Parry and E. Tov; Leiden: Brill, 2005).

In poetic contexts, אשה appears once in the poem at the end of the *Rule of the Community* (IQS XI,21 = 4QS 264 8), three times in the *Hodayot* (IQH^a V,31; XXI,2; XXIII,14), and three times in non-sectarian psalmic/lament type material (4Q179 2 6, 7; 4Q501 5; 4Q381 1 7). There are five occurrences in liturgical works (4Q502 1 3, 34 3, 309 1; 4Q512 40 –41 2; 4Q506 131–132 3). In 4Q176, it comes twice (8–11 7, 8) in the *lemma* quotations from *Isaiah* (and is to be reconstructed in another *lemma* in 1–2 ii 3).

אשה occurs two times in the pesharim, in the interpretative comments (IQpHab VI,11; 4Q169 3–4 iv 4); in addition, 4Q178 7 1 may be another occurrence in a peshar. (14) There are a substantial number of occurrences in works of the “Rewritten Bible” category, seven in copies of *Jubilees* (4Q221, 4Q223–24, 11Q12); eight in *Reworked Pentateuch* (4Q158 and 4Q364–367 (15)); and in *Paraphrase of Genesis and Exodus* (4Q422 II 4), and *Meditation on Creation* (4Q303 1 1). Finally, there are four occurrences in Wisdom documents, three in 4QInstruction (4Q416 2 iii 20; 2 iv 5, 13) and one in 4Q426 1 i 14.

The distribution of the word אשה per se in the Hebrew texts corresponds with what Moshe Bernstein observed in his more extensive and schematic survey: that it is in the halakhic and liturgical texts that there is a “pervasive textual presence of women.” (16) When we turn to the Aramaic corpus, the distribution looks somewhat different. The majority of the occurrences are in narratives and most often אנה refers to a specific woman/wife. There are twenty-one occurrences in the *Genesis Apocryphon*: three refer to Bitenosh, the wife of Lamech; two refer to Amzara, the wife of Noah, and another three to the unnamed wives of the sons of Noah; twelve places are referring to Sarai; and one to the wife of Lot. In the multiple copies of *Tobit* (4Q196–4Q200) there are seven occurrences; two refer to Ana, wife of Tobit; three refer to Sarah, and one to Edna, wife of Raguel and mother of Sarah; one usage is a general reference to “man or woman = anyone” (4Q197 4 i 13). In the *Visions of Amran* there are five distinct references in seven occurrences in the multiple copies (4Q544–4Q549): three refer to Jokabed, the wife of Amram, one to Miriam, the daughter of Amran who is given to Uzziel in marriage, and there is one reference to “women” plural with no context. In the Aramaic

(14) For the proposal that 4Q178 is a copy, 4QMidrEschar^d, see A. Steudel, *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumran-gemeinde* (4QMidrEshar^{a,b}) (STDJ 13; Leiden, Brill, 1994), 154–55.

(15) Of course, if these manuscripts, or some of them, are classified as “biblical,” then these figures would shift to be counted with occurrences in the Hebrew Bible; see the discussion of M. Segal, “4QReworked Pentateuch or 4QPentateuch?,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After their Discovery* (ed. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: IES and The Shrine of the Book, 2000), 391–99.

(16) M. Bernstein, “Women and Children in Legal and Liturgical Texts from Qumran,” *DSD* 11 (2004): 191–211.

copies of the *Book of Enoch*, there are two references to the women whom the watchers took as wives (4Q201 1 iii 14 // 4Q202 1 ii 18 and 4Q201 1 iv 5), and in 4QEn^c (4Q204 5 i 27) a reference to Enoch taking a wife for his son Methuselah. In *The Book of the Giants* (4Q203 8 7, 8) there are two reference to the wives of the giants.

The distribution is in line with the distinctive nature of the Aramaic corpus where there are so many more narratives. There is one occurrence in what seems to be a halakhic context, in *Aramaic Levi*, 4Q213a 3 13, in a passage about a woman defiling the name of her father by exogamous marriage. (17) There are also a few Aramaic texts where אִנְתָּה has no real context: 4Q214 3 3 “honoured from women,” and the non-identified *Aramaic Texts C* and *D* (4Q570 9 2 and 4Q586l 2).

(c) Many or few?

Although it might seem logical, and an obvious place to start, to give the number of occurrences of אִשָּׁה (109) and אִנְתָּה (48), the numbers by themselves mean little. Should we feel encouraged that there are so many places where the word is attested, or depressed because there are so few? How do we decide? A few moments of reflection reinforce the limitations of making too much of numbers.

In the first place, whether אִשָּׁה/אִנְתָּה happens to be preserved in a given text is just so random. For instance, as noted above, in our fragmentary copies of *Jubilees*, אִשָּׁה is preserved eight times, but within even these circumscribed sections of *Jubilees* the word can be restored at least ten more times on the basis of the Ethiopic text. That is, there were certainly many more occurrences of אִשָּׁה that are lost to our count now because of the ravages of rain and mouse. Sometimes this happens in passages that clearly deal with women so that, because of just where the damages come, these would not appear on a אִשָּׁה word list (e.g., a list does not point us to 4Q271 3 1–15, one of the longest and most studied passages about women). In other clearly relevant texts, the word simply does not appear (e.g., 4Q184, *Wiles of the Wicked Woman*). Furthermore there are at least seven places where the pronoun הִיא clearly refers to a female (not a noun that is grammatically feminine) but these passages do not show up in our word count.

However, even with all these caveats, let us play a bit with numbers. One obvious comparison is between the number of appearances of אִשָּׁה as compared to the occurrences of אִישׁ. In the scrolls, there are 1132 attestations of אִישׁ. (18) אִישׁ is obviously much more frequent: a

(17) This is the numbering of the fragment in the revised enumeration in *DJD* XXXVII, p. 512. It is less likely that the passage is a specific reference to Dinah (see the discussion of Puech *ad loc.*).

(18) Give or take a few, depending on readings and reconstructions. This number is taken from the “Kurze Lemmaliste” supplied by the *ThWQ* project.

10:1 ratio (1132 versus 110, based on Hebrew); if the 48 Aramaic occurrences are included, about a 7:1 ratio.

This becomes more interesting when compared with figures from the Hebrew Bible, where we have approximately 2179 uses of **אִישׁ** versus 781 of **אִשָּׁה** (plus the single occurrence in Biblical Aramaic in *Dan* 6:25). That is, the ratio of **אִשָּׁה** to **אִישׁ** is slightly over a third, and significantly more proportionally than in the scrolls. Or, to state this in another way: **אִישׁ** occurs approximately twice as frequently in the Hebrew Bible as compared to the scrolls (2179 to 1132); **אִשָּׁה** occurs 781 in the Bible, 157 times in the scrolls, over four times more in the Hebrew Bible than in the scrolls.

But this should not be surprising given what we have observed about distributional patterns. The biblical occurrences of **אִשָּׁה** are concentrated in the historical narratives, over 500 out of 781 occurrences (about 2/3) in *Genesis*, *Exodus*, *Joshua-Judges*, *Samuel-Kings*, *Esther* and *Chronicles*. (19) Such extended narratives are just what we do not have in the non-biblical Hebrew scrolls (except for rather short passages in *Jubilees* and the *Rewritten Pentateuch*) and the Aramaic corpus, where such narratives are more common, is overall limited in extent.

In her article on “Women” in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Phyllis Bird paid special attention to numbers. She commented on the 3:1 ratio (2179 to 781) of **אִישׁ** to **אִשָּׁה** in the Hebrew Bible and interpreted that positively, as an indicator of “the importance of women as a social category, if not named individuals.” (20) Furthermore, she noted that the ratio is even better if we allow that that in some places **אִישׁ** is generic (for instance, as she would read *Ps* 1:1, **אֲשֶׁרִי הָאִישׁ** “happy is the person”), thus extending the presence of women to many additional texts. I assume she would interpret the scrolls ratio of 7:1 (and even allowing also that there are additional generic expressions in the scrolls, as we will examine in the final part of the paper) as indicating something of the lesser importance of women as a social category in the scrolls.

(d) Other Designations of Females

Attempting to draw inferences about the importance and status of women in an article on **אִשָּׁה** is, of course, limited by the fact that women are frequently designated by other terms. A cursory survey reveals that relational terms in the scrolls, when taken together, are as numerous as occurrences of **אִשָּׁה**, that is, we double the passages under consideration when we include even the basic terms: **בַּת** daughter

(19) These figures are taken from the entry on **אִשָּׁה** in E. Jenni and C. Westermann, *Theological Lexicon of the Old Testament* (trans. By M. E. Biddle; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1997).

(20) P. Bird, “Women (OT),” *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (ed. D.N. Freedman; New York; Double day, 1992), 6.953.

(52x); **אם** mother (40x); (21) **אחות** sister (14x); in Aramaic: **ברה** daughter (19x); **אם** mother (6x); **אחה** sister (4x). Other designations are related to age, occupation, martial, sexual and social status: **אלמנה** widow (9x); **אמה** female servant (10x); **בתולה** young girl (6x); **הריה** pregnant woman (9x); **זקנה** (4x (22)); **ילדה** female child (1x); **כלה** bride (1x); **מנקת** wetnurse (1x); **נערה** girl (13x), **נקבה** female (9x). In Aramaic texts, **אמה** maidservant (1x); **ארמלה** widow (2x); **בתולה** (2x); **ילדה** midwife (1x); **נקבה** female (8x); **עלימא** youth (3x). For a comprehensive picture, we would have to include those cases where women are designated only by a female participle and by circumlocations (e.g., **כלי חיקבה** in 4Q416 2 ii 21, see discussion below).

Methodologically, I was initially concerned whether perhaps in texts by certain authors or coming from certain circles there might be a consistent predilection (for whatever reason) for using a term other than **אשה** when talking of females — so that counting only **אשה** usage would necessarily give a skewed result. I was alerted to the possibility when I looked at the number of occurrences of **נקבה**, which at first glance seemed to be disproportionally high. That is, **זכר** comes eighty-two times in Biblical Hebrew; **נקבה** twenty-two times, almost a 1:4 ratio; in the scrolls, **זכר** comes nineteen times; **נקבה**, nine times, an unexpectedly high ratio of 1:2. Was there perhaps a preference for **נקבה** instead of **אשה** by certain authors? (23) But this was not really sustained on closer examination. Most uses of **נקבה** are either in passages directly dependent on *Gen* 1:27 (“he created them **זכר** and **נקבה**”) or quoting another biblical verse with **נקבה** (e.g., 4Q265 7 16 quoting *Lev* 12:5). And in at least one case, where we might expect to find **נקבה** in combination with **זכר**, we have instead **אשה**: *CD* V,9-10, the regulations are written for males (**לזכרים**) but apply likewise to females (**וכהם הנשים**). When we have the dictionary entries for all terms for females, including a comparison with the relative frequency in biblical usage, possible predilections for one term over another may become more obvious.

(e) Specific expressions with **אשה**

Most of the ways that **אשה** are used in the scrolls are very similar to what we find in biblical Hebrew. There are many of the same adjectival combinations (e.g. **אשה הרה** 4Q270 2 ii 16), and verbal

(21) In at least one passage in the *Damascus Document*, 4Q270 7 i 13–15, **אמות** is almost certainly not a term of physical relationship but the designation of a leadership position in the community.

(22) In the four occurrences in the “*Rituel de Mariage*” (4Q502) whether this is a term for chronological age or whether it refers to a designated leadership position requires further study.

(23) Possibly in 4QInstruction which uses **נקבה** three times and **אשה** only once (apart from the idiom **אשת חיקבה**)?

idioms (e.g., לקח אשה, קרב אל אשתו); the biblical combination אשת חיקכה (Deut 13:7, 28:54) is probably taken up in 4Q416 2 iv 5, 13 (although on material grounds, the reading אשת חוקכה “your lawful wife” would be possible, creating an otherwise unattested expression (24)). The biblical legal formula איש או אשה (Ex 21:29, Lev 13:29 38, 20:27, Num 5:6, 6:2, Deut 17:2, 29:17) appears only once in freely-composed sectarian regulations, in the *Purification Ritual*, 4Q512 40–41 2; (25) the fact that it was added above the line may suggest an intent to make explicit that this blessing applies to both men and women.

Two idioms that are frequent in the Scrolls are the specific expressions for a human person that highlight birth from a female: “born of a woman” ילוד אשה and בן אמתך “son of your handmaid.” Both are biblical expressions, the first appearing in Job 14:1, 15:14, 25:4, Sir 10:18; the second in Ps 86:16, 116:16. As has often been noted, it is only with these idioms that women appear at all in *Rule of the Community*, in the *Hodayot*-style poem in IQS XI,16; XI,21// 4Q264 8. In the *Hodayot* אשה ילוד occurs in IQH^a V,31; XXI,2; XXIII,14 and is almost certainly to be reconstructed in XXI,10; בן אמתך occurs once in IQH^a VIII,36. All of these are poems that customarily allotted to the “Hymns of the Community” category; there are no occurrences in the “Hymns of the Teacher.” The phrase אשה ילוד also appears in *Apocryphal Lament B* (4Q501 5) and probably in 4Q482 1 4, (26) and בן אמתך twice in 4Q381 15 2 (as a quote of Ps 86) and 33 5; these are all non-sectarian compositions which suggests the wider attraction of these biblical expressions in Second Temple poetry.

Idioms and combinations that do not have parallels in biblical Hebrew are of particular interest. As with all such vocabulary that is unattested except in the scrolls, there is always the question: is this an ‘old’ and ‘ordinary’ expression that by chance only happens to be preserved in Qumran Hebrew, or are we seeing something that is distinctively sectarian or at least late Persian-Hellenistic terminology. A couple of such expressions are found: כאשת מרורים “a woman of bitterness” in *Apocryphal Lamentations A* (4Q179 2 7); “the error of women” תעות הנשים in the Hebrew of Jub 35:14 (4Q223-224 2 ii 8),

(24) See the discussion of Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* XXXIV, 128. In both places, their transcription indicates that either *yod* or *waw* is possible.

(25) The other occurrences in 4Q251 8 5 and 11Q19 LV,16 and 21 are in direct quotations of biblical verses.

(26) Although the editor, M. Baillet (*DJD* VII) suggested that this manuscript may be a copy of *Jubilees*, this identification has not been accepted by J. VanderKam because much of it, including this phrase, have no parallels in the Ethiopic of *Jubilees*; see “The Jubilees Fragments,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18–21 March 1991* (STDJ 11.2; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 642, n. 27.

parallel to “the impurity of women” **טומאת הנשים** (27). There is probably a previously unattested expression in *4QInstruction* (4Q416 2 ii 21), “do not treat with dishonour the vessel of your bosom” (**כלי** (חיקכה), though this interpretation as referring to a woman, that was adopted by the editors in the *editio princeps*, has been contested. (28)

The *Damascus Document* contains a most interesting and distinctive phrase in 4Q269 9 7// 4Q270 5 21//4Q271 3 14, “trustworthy and knowledgeable women” **נשים נאמנות וידעות**; likewise in 4Q159 2-4 9, **נאמנות** should be read as a feminine plural participle “trustworthy women” (though here without **נשים**). (29) In the *Damascus Document*, the context is the situation where a woman has acquired a “bad reputation” (**שם רע**) before marriage; in 4Q159 (based on *Deut* 22: 13–21), it is the accusation by a husband that his wife was not a virgin on their wedding night. Provision is made for the matter to be resolved by women (usually understood as midwives) who “see” (4Q270 5 21)/ “examine” (4Q159 2–4 8), presumably referring to some form of physical examination. These women are skilled and trustworthy; the latter is the technical term for reliable witnesses in *CD* IX, 22, 23. Wassen situated this regulation as part of a pre-sectarian law code and secondarily expanded by a sectarian addition (“selected by the command of the **מבקר** over the **Many**”), that is, although the skill and trustworthiness of these women are acknowledged, there is a mechanism to bring them under the authority of the community leadership. (30)

(f) Masculine linguistic forms that include women

Given the grammatical structure of the Hebrew/Aramaic language, that the masculine form (singular and plural) is dominant and can, at times, include women, (31) we can rightly inquire about whether there are places in the scrolls where women are being addressed or spoken about in forms that are linguistically masculine.

(27) As restored by J. VanderKam on the basis of the Ethiopic, *DJD* XIII.

(28) See the discussion of Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* XXXIV, 108–10, and the more extensive discussion in J. Strugnell, “More on Wives and Marriage in the Dead Sea Scroll,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 538–40. For the proposal to interpret this idiom as referring to the male organ, T. Elgvin, “To Master His Own Vessel: 1 Thess 4.4 in Light of New Qumran Evidence,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 604–19; M. Kister proposed a different reading, **חוקכה בלי בלל** “not [according to] your prescribed portion,” “A Qumranic Parallel to 1 Thess 4:4?” *DSD* 10 (2003): 365–70.

(29) That is, not as an abstract noun “trustworthiness” as read by J. Allegro in *DJD* V, and F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*.

(30) C. Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (AB 21; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 80–88, 201–2.

(31) As recognized in all standard grammars and dictionaries; see the helpful and challenging survey by D. E. S. Stein, “The Grammar of Social Gender in Biblical Hebrew,” *Hebrew Studies* 49 (2008): 7–26.

Obviously how this question is answered depends on a whole set of presuppositions that we bring to the reading of these texts and whether there is a link (however it is to be construed) between these texts and a historical “real” community. If our reconstructed community is made up only of males, there is little reason to suspect that the masculine formulation includes anyone but men. But if we allow that, even though the dominant stance is overwhelmingly androcentric, there are sufficient reasons to conclude that the lived reality was more complex, that women were part of the community being addressed and thus hearers of these texts, then it is necessary to ask in each concrete instance — are women included here?

To read, even heuristically, with the assumption that women are present in the text, that they are included in masculine linguistic forms unless there is a specific reason to think that they are not, makes many texts relevant for the study of woman. If, for example, we are looking for passages where women are characterized as knowing and wise, we can not limit ourselves only to places with specific female terms (the “knowledgeable and trustworthy women” of the *Damascus Document* that were discussed above, the “daughter of truth” 4Q502 1-3 6). Equally relevant are such designations as “those who know righteousness” ועתה שמעו לי כול יודעי צדק (CD I, 1); “the wise of the congregation, the knowledgeable, the perfect of way” כול IQSa I 28; (32) the exhortation to the wise in the *Hodayot* ושמעו חכמים ושחי דעת (1QH^a IX,35).

This article has presented only a few preliminary reflections on what the writing of a theological dictionary can contribute to the study of women in the scrolls. Based largely on a study of only the word אשה, it awaits the completion of the entries on all of the other relevant terms. Much more work remains to be done before we have exhausted both the challenges and the rewards of a “word-orientated” search for a better understanding of women in the Dead Sea Scrolls.

Eileen SCHULLER

(32) This is reading with the assumption that women are among the Council of the Community. Although it has often been assumed that they are excluded from the Council, see the strong arguments for their inclusion in Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document*, 14–54.

DATING THE ARAMAIC TEXTS FROM QUMRAN: POSSIBILITIES AND LIMITS

A CHAPTER or paragraph on the date of composition features in almost all editions of the major Aramaic texts from Qumran, and understandably so. For only a sound chronological framework allows one to trace, albeit roughly, the history of certain key ideas in the corpus. (1) This is also true for the gradual development of genres and literary forms as it is for terminology. It does not fall within the scope of this paper to address the so-called “scriptorium controversy,” (2) but most scholars accept the view that the Aramaic texts have been imported from outside into the community, presumably copied at Qumran, and perhaps even adapted for the needs of the Qumran people. Hence, such work also serves a more general purpose and endeavours to cast some light on the still little-known literary history of Aramaic at large during the two or three centuries after the fall of the Achaemenid Empire. All this has an obvious bearing on the development of semantic fields in light of the available lexical resources. Naturally, a study along similar lines would be much harder to carry out for Qumran Hebrew, because due to the scarcity of the material, any attempt to determine its relationship with earlier and later forms of Hebrew is wrought with fundamental difficulties. Given its unbroken attestation, Aramaic thus provides one with a more suitable methodological laboratory.

As the results of any diachronic investigation affect a broad range of topics in and outside Qumran research, it seems thus worth-

(1) A case in point is the development of a priestly theology on the basis of the relationships between *Aramaic Levi* and two other sacerdotal writings, that is, the *Testament of Qahat* and the *Visions of Amram* that have been claimed to depend on it: É. Puech, “Le Testament de Qahat en araméen de la grotte 4 (4QTQah),” *RevQ* 15 (1988): 23-54.

(2) Many bibliographical references have conveniently been assembled by S.E. Fassberg, “Qumran Aramaic,” *MAARAV* 9 (2002): 19-31, esp. 21-22.

while to critically survey the assumptions underlying previous attempts to anchor the Aramaic compositions in time and place. The history of Aramaic as a group of languages and its internal subdivision continues to be a matter of debate with new material, or fresh ideas, adjusting the general picture from time to time. For that reason, a regular check of established methods and “best practice” is imperative. A number of relevant facts were yet undiscovered fifty years ago, when E. Y. Kutscher set up his landmark in a field which was then practically virgin ground. (3) The influence of his paper, the first study devoted to this topic on a sound philological basis, still sets the pace for the current debate. Against the backdrop of what can be known about Aramaic today, however, some basic suppositions, often taken for granted even in the most recent publications, should be addressed once again at greater length. (4) Obviously, the scope of the present paper is insufficient for that, so I shall confine myself by and large to pointing out possible pitfalls instead of coming up, like a magician, with a precise and comprehensive list of dates.

Given the paucity of unambiguous references to contemporary political events in the corpus and the often subjective nature of inferences from the alleged development of certain theological ideas, palaeography appears to provide the most objective criterion. The unidirectional development of characteristic letter-forms within one particular style, or “register,” enables one to create a relative chronology of different types of scripts, such as the famous “Hasmonaeon” and “Herodian” classes, and fit the evidence into that pattern. (5) Radiocarbon dating and a detailed comparison with dated manuscripts, especially the legal documents from Naḥal Ḥever, Naḥal Se’elim and other places in the Dead Sea region, can provide Archimedean points in “absolute” chronology. However, even if one firmly believes in the fundamental reliability of the typological method, the date thus obtained is by definition only the one of an individual manuscript representing a particular text. Unless it can be

(3) E.Y. Kutscher, “The Language of the ‘Genesis Apocryphon’: A Preliminary Study,” in *Aspects of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Scripta Hierosolymitana 4; Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1958), 1-35.

(4) One can only wonder, for example, what rational base underlies the distinction in U. Schattner-Rieser, *L’araméen des manuscrits de la mer Morte I: Grammaire* (Prahins: Éditions du Zèbre, 2004), 25-26, between “older” texts like the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, some of which allegedly date from the Persian period, and “later” compositions like the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Targum of Job*. A reasonable *terminus post quem* for the *Prayer of Nabonidus* is the late fourth or early third century B.C.E, on which see A. Lange and M. Sieker, “Gattung und Quellenwert des Gebets des Nabonid,” in *Qumranstudien*, eds. H.-J. Fabry, A. Lange, and H. Lichtenberger (*Schriften des Institutum Judaicum Delitzschianum* 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 3-34, here 6-8.

(5) This method has been outlined by F.M. Cross, “The Development of the Jewish Scripts,” in *The Bible and the Ancient Near East*, ed. G.E. Wright (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1961), 133-202.

convincingly demonstrated that the respective manuscript is in fact the autograph, which of course would be very difficult (an impressive array of counter-arguments has been marshalled after J. A. Fitzmyer suggested that *IQ20* was the author's copy of the *Genesis Apocryphon* despite the general proximity in time to the period of composition), palaeography yields nothing more than a *terminus ad quem* at best. Nonetheless, not all commentators consistently observe the fundamental distinction between the hypothetical date of a manuscript and the time when its contents has been composed or prepared for final redaction.

For more conclusive results, one therefore still depends on an interpretation of the development of linguistic features. Methodologically, this approach bears a close resemblance to palaeographic taxonomy, except for the significant difference that at least certain elements of grammar constitute a core part of a text, whereas the hand of a particular manuscript representing that text does not. As a consequence, not all possible hallmarks are equally relevant: orthography can easily undergo modifications in the course of scribal activities, whereas morphology, vocabulary, and above all syntax prove less susceptible to secondary changes, although that, too, can happen, especially with long chains of transmission. A recent text can, whether on purpose or not, misguide its reader by appearing in a classicizing garb and *vice versa*. The validity of an interpreter's judgment on these matters stands and falls with an adequate knowledge of the evolution of Aramaic in its various forms.

Studies which tackle this question often presuppose, explicitly or implicitly, that Aramaic developed in a linear way. According to Fitzmyer's widespread model, (6) often referred to in Qumran studies, an older stage labelled "Imperial Aramaic" and best represented by dozens of dated documentary texts as well as letters on papyrus from fifth-century Elephantine in Egypt, (7) was succeeded about 200 B.C.E. by another phase during which the former standard idiom of the Achaemenid chancellery gave way to a number of local dialects. This "Middle Aramaic" stage includes, among others, the language of the numerous literary compositions in Aramaic from Qumran and is said to have lasted until about 200 C.E., when it was succeeded by "Late Aramaic." Since older features and innovations occur side by side in the Qumran material, it exhibits a certain transitory character between Achaemenid Aramaic, or "Official Aramaic," and later Palestinian Aramaic. Although Biblical Aramaic is often used as a

(6) Succinctly presented in J.A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1 (IQ20). A Commentary* (3d ed.); *Biblica et Orientalia* 18/B (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 2004), 30-32.

(7) For a concise description, see now M.L. Folmer, "Alt- und Reichsaramäisch," in *Sprachen aus der Welt des Alten Testaments*, ed. H. Gzella (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2009), 104-31.

representative of the older stage in Qumran scholarship, the papyri from Egypt (which were much less well-known when the initial attempts to date the Qumran texts had been undertaken) now provide a more trustworthy point of comparison, especially because the dust has not settled on the linguistic position of the Book of *Daniel* in its different stages of development. As has often been emphasized, some forms of pronouns and suffixes in *Daniel* seem younger than their counterparts in *Ezra*, but may have only entered the text in the course of redactional history. On the other hand, the verbal syntax of *Daniel* exhibits a number of innovative features less likely to be secondary. (8)

Unfortunately, neither “Middle Aramaic” in general nor “Qumran Aramaic” in particular (taken here to mean the language of the Aramaic corpus from Qumran proper in a purely descriptive sense, without any straightforward historical implications) form a linguistic unity in any remote sense of the word. It is therefore quite misleading to think that the Achaemenid *koiné* as such was simply replaced by newly-emerging vernaculars. On the contrary, some of these alleged newcomers have roots long antedating the rise of the Persian Empire. Only when a wave of novel self-awareness washed over various Aramaic-speaking communities during the last decades of the moribund Seleucid Empire, several Aramaic vernaculars, which in all likelihood had developed further beneath the surface of the textual record even during the Achaemenid age, were promoted to written languages. In other words, many of them did not simply come into being after the end of the Persian chancellery; rather, they had long been in the make, but eclipsed by the prestige of Official Aramaic. Even in a relatively small area such as Palestine, a number of different forms of Aramaic are attested by material written during the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

These new written languages competed with the waning power of a once forceful scribal tradition, a process which led to different degrees of interference in the individual corpora subsumed under Fitzmyer’s generic though still useful umbrella term “Middle Aramaic.” Especially orthographic standards, but also some distinctive elements of morphology and phraseology, were borrowed from Official Aramaic and thus preserved long after the latter had fallen out of use; they constitute the base of a shared literary heritage sometimes called, in the footsteps of J. C. Greenfield, “Standard Literary Aramaic.” (9) Due to the fact that Aramaic formed a so-called “dialect continuum” in which different varieties between the eastern and the

(8) See H. Gzella, *Tempus, Aspekt und Modalität im Reichsaramäischen* (Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 48; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), 136, 215, 230.

(9) For an outline of a more complex history of Aramaic, see H. Gzella, “The Heritage of Imperial Aramaic in Eastern Aramaic,” *Aramaic Studies* 6 (2009): 85-109.

western periphery interacted with each other, just like, for example, Dutch and German, there were of course common developments spreading across the entire speech area along axes of social contact. Yet since "Middle Aramaic" itself is not homogeneous, a less static approach seems necessary for better assessing the historical-linguistic implications of the Aramaic material from the Judaeen Desert, thereby possibly also providing a better comparative framework for the contents and cultural background of the texts.

Like other languages belonging to the "Middle Aramaic" stage, "Qumran Aramaic" exhibits the same intersection of an erstwhile universal standard language, more faithfully preserved in legal documents from other sites nearby the Dead Sea, and the Aramaic dialect of Judaea which had presumably arrived in the region long before the Achaemenids. Furthermore, the unbroken prestige of Hebrew as a literary language in Palestine exercised an influence on many Aramaic compositions, especially those which elaborate on biblical material. This results in such a considerable diversity of coexisting linguistic features in each individual text that it is very hard to positively define "Qumran Aramaic" as opposed to all other forms of Aramaic contemporaneous with it. As a consequence, one can reasonably suppose also on linguistic grounds that not all texts share a common origin, although many of them may have been copied by scribes who adhered to similar traditions. Since the textual witnesses vary greatly in length and state of preservation, not every manuscript contains a sufficient amount of significant features which would permit an unequivocal diachronic assessment of its language. Following Kutscher's seminal article from 1958 on the language of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, published in 1956 as one of the first Aramaic texts from the Dead Sea region, a number of more recent studies on the linguistic position of "Qumran Aramaic" have appeared, thereby also including texts published in the meantime. Longer compositions like the *Targum of Job* (11Q10), the Enochic material from Cave Four, the manuscripts of the *New Jerusalem* apocalypse (4Q554–555 and 11Q18), the *Visions of Amram* (4Q543–548), the *Apocryphon of Levi* (4Q540–541), the *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542), and the Aramaic fragments of the *Book of Tobit* (4Q196–199) occupy a particularly prominent place in the discussion, whereas shorter pieces like, for instance, the *Messianic Apocalypse* or the *Prayer of Nabonidus*, to mention only two, can amend the general picture or confirm its validity. Some of them have already been the object of a more or less detailed investigation in Kutscher's vein, but a comprehensive reassessment of their language seems overdue. The problem is aggravated by the fact that there is still no scholarly reference grammar of the Aramaic corpus.

Depending on the theoretical framework they employ, all existing studies of which I am aware interpret the linguistic facts

either historically (this is still the dominant approach), geographically, (10) or socially. (11) By and large, they depart from the same, limited, set of basic features, yet more than once arrive at markedly different conclusions. These well-known features, insofar as they have classificatory relevance, can be grouped into characteristic traits of spelling, morphology, and morphosyntax. The most important ones include the following:

1. Inconsistent spellings (besides the general tendency towards *plene* writing (12)):
 - (a) A more conservative spelling of the relative marker {dy}, which reflects the older form /dī/, alternates with {d}. The latter presupposes the more recent change from /dī/ to proclitic /d(a)-/, as is common in Post-Achaemenid Aramaic. In all likelihood, /d(a)-/, or perhaps /di-/ as an intermediate stage, has already been generalized in pronunciation but not yet in orthography. The coexistence of {dy} and {d} would thus be an alternation in spelling alone.
 - (b) The prefix of the causative stem is sometimes spelled with {h} (especially in *IQ10*), pointing to the older form of the morpheme /ha-/. Mostly, however, it is spelled with {'}, because /ha-/ had been weakened to /'a-/. As with the relative particle, this must imply that the underlying phonetic change had long happened, because orthography tends to lag behind advances in pronunciation. Consequently, this variation, too, comes down to an alternation between a traditional and a more modern spelling.
 - (c) As in Official Aramaic, long (“geminate”) consonants are resolved, at least in spelling, by the letter {n}. (13)

(10) E.M. Cook, “Qumran Aramaic and Aramaic Dialectology,” in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, ed. T. Muraoka (*Abr-Nahrain Supplement* 3; Louvain: Peeters, 1992), 1-21, attempted to assign “Qumran Aramaic” a place within contemporary Aramaic using methods of dialect geography. Plotting isoglosses on a map is, however, not entirely applicable to a literary language in which features from various dialects occur side by side.

(11) Approaches informed by sociolinguistics will be briefly discussed at the end of the present paper.

(12) Supposedly, this tendency includes the famous case of the second person masculine singular suffix {kh}, instead of older {k}, for /-kā/ (see S. Fassberg, “Qumran Aramaic,” 24-25). For the time being, it must be left open whether this results from the influence of Hebrew spelling practice or represents an internal development.

(13) For scores of examples, see W. Randall Garr, “Prenasalization in Aramaic,” in *Studies in Semitic and Afroasiatic Linguistics Presented to Gene B. Gragg*, ed. C.L. Miller (*Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization* 60; Chicago, Illinois: The Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, 2007), 81-109, esp. 93-94 (who considers degemination in Aramaic as a phonetic phenomenon).

Whether this practice, which first and foremost targets secondary geminates produced by assimilation, corresponds to any phonetic reality in Aramaic or not, it has clearly been inherited from the Achaemenid chancellery tradition (where it is an innovation due to Babylonian influence). Instances with and without {n}, often of the same word, occur side by side also in the Qumran corpus. Evidence from later pointing systems, such as the *linea occultans* in Syriac, as well as internal considerations point to an orthographic rather than a phonetic variation. Consequently, the letter {n} resolving consonantal length is considered an old-fashioned spelling here.

2. Morphological variation:

- (a) Instead of *dnh* /denā/, or the even older spelling *znh*, the masculine singular proximal demonstrative (“this”) in the Qumran Aramaic corpus is mostly *dn*. Due to the general tendency towards increasingly *plene* writing, the form *dn* presumably reflects a genuine morphological change and not a novel defective orthography.
- (b) Another important diagnostic feature of the individual Aramaic languages is the direct object marker used by a particular variety. Again, the Qumran corpus exhibits some variation between Official Aramaic /la-/, the most widespread form, and a few instances of Western Aramaic /yāt/.
- (c) The conditional particle (“if”) oscillates between the standard variant *hn* /hen/ and the by-form *’n* /’en/.
- (d) Several words and forms ending in a long vowel have by-forms expanded by /n/, especially *tnn* /tannān/ “here” instead of older *tnh* and *kmn* /kamān/ “how?” instead of *kmh/km’*, as well as the pronouns *hmwn* /hemūn/ “they” (from older *hm(w)*) with its by-form *’nwn* and *’l(y)n* /’ellēn/ “these” as opposed to *’lh*. This process affects more than one lexeme.
- (e) Occasionally, infinitives of the derived stems with an /m-/ prefix reappear in the corpus, besides the standard forms without such a prefix.

3. The most distinctive morphosyntactic hallmark of the Aramaic texts from Qumran is the retention of the negation /’al/ followed by the “short imperfect” (or: “jussive”) for negative commands. There are numerous examples to be found in different texts across the corpus, even though all contemporary varieties of Aramaic replaced /’al/ with the “short imperfect” by /lā/ followed by the “long imperfect”. Perhaps it was

preserved due to the influence of Second Temple Hebrew, where the same construction continued to be used.

In addition to that, one can identify a number of phonetic peculiarities in certain words or roots. Many of them involve a reflex of the Proto-Semitic phoneme */š/, which had merged with /ʿ/ long before the second century B.C.E., and another laryngeal. These two laryngeals were dissimilated in later Aramaic varieties in that one of them regularly turned into /ʿ/, but the spelling of the Qumran corpus at large suggests that the underlying phonetic change was, if anything, only incipient in the Hasmonaean period. (14)

The amount of Hebrew influences, by contrast, most of which are lexical loans or loan translations related to the semantic fields of cult, ethics, and religion, (15) seems to be evenly spread across the corpus, excepting, for whatever reason, a disproportionately high number in the *Testament of Qahat*. (16) Since most occurrences of Hebrew terms are thus punctual and specific (or derive from Hebrew phraseology if not actual texts, as in certain passages of the *Genesis Apocryphon* and the *Targum of Job*), one cannot detect either an increase or a decline of such lexical influences. As a result, they have no independent value for the purpose of dating. Rather, Hebrew in its various manifestations was a lexical resource readily available for technical terminology or synonyms in stylistic parallelism.

Quite obviously, then, several different elements have been woven into the fabric of the corpus to which the term “Qumran Aramaic” refers. The usual historical-linguistic approaches envisage to establish a relative chronology of the texts according to the frequency of archaisms, that is, typical features of older Aramaic varieties which were gradually disappearing after the Achaemenid period. Those compositions which exhibit a greater number of straightforward Official Aramaic hallmarks are therefore often viewed as older, whereas a later date is attributed to those typologically closer to Judaeon Aramaic as reflected chiefly by the Bar Kosiba letters and a number of funerary inscriptions from the same period. The guiding idea is that those seemingly “later” features increase over time. When clear-cut historical allusions are absent from a text and one’s limited knowledge of the evolution of literary forms and motives

(14) See the valuable overview by M. Sokoloff, “Qumran Aramaic in Relation to the Aramaic Dialects,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years after their Discovery. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20–25, 1997*, eds. L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J.C. VanderKam (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 746–54, esp. 748–50.

(15) Now conveniently assembled and extensively discussed by C. Stadel, *Hebraismen in den aramäischen Texten vom Toten Meer* (Heidelberg: Winter, 2008).

(16) As remarked by Stadel, *Hebraismen*, 60, who tentatively entertains the possibility that this text was translated from a Hebrew original.

does not allow one to penetrate beyond subjective judgments, a taxonomy of grammatical features has to bear all the weight. For the *Genesis Apocryphon* as the longest representative of "Qumran Aramaic," it has been suggested by Kutscher, and often repeated thereafter, that the text was composed between the first century B.C.E. and the first century C.E., because it appears to be typologically "later" than the Book of *Daniel* whose language as such is dated to the period of the final redaction, i.e., the second century B.C.E. (17) Nowadays, by contrast, several scholars would prefer to date much of the material in *Daniel* a century earlier.

The arguments presented in the course of this discussion still constitute the Archimedean point for dating other Aramaic writings from Qumran, soon supplemented by a analogous debate about the *Targum of Job*, which is assigned to either the third (Beyer), (18) the second (van der Ploeg and van der Woude; Sokoloff, albeit with some hesitation), (19) or the first century B.C.E. (Kaufman), (20) but in any case relatively older than the *Genesis Apocryphon*. Subsequently, the Enochic material, to which a date slightly later than the *Targum of Job* has been attributed, (21) and the *Testament of Qahat*, the profile of whose orthography "gives an impression of lateness," (22) have undergone a similar analysis. Within a linear framework, the relative sequence of composition of the core texts between the early third and the early first centuries B.C.E. would be: Aramaic *Daniel*, *Targum of Job*, *Enoch*, *Genesis Apocryphon*.

However, an approach entertaining the possibility of a non-linear development of Aramaic, as suggested above, would also have to take other factors into account in order to explain variation in the corpus. From that point of view, things turn out to be less simple than they appear at first glance. Most importantly, one has to apply a

(17) Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 26-28, gives a brief review of the discussion.

(18) K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer I* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1984), 283.

(19) See M. Sokoloff, *The Targum to Job from Qumran Cave XI* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 1974), 25, who also summarizes the earlier literature on this point.

(20) S.A. Kaufman, "The Job Targum from Qumran", *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 93 (1973): 317-27, who also emphasizes the relative priority of the *Targum of Job* and thus re-dates the *Genesis Apocryphon* to the first century C.E.

(21) M. Sokoloff, "Notes on the Aramaic Fragments of Enoch from Qumran Cave 4," *MAARAV* 1/2 (1978-79): 197-224, esp. 203-204, and R.I. Vasholz, "An Additional Note on the 4QEnoch Fragments and 11TgJob," *MAARAV* 3/1 (1982): 115-118.

(22) E.M. Cook, "Remarks on the Testament of Kohath from Qumran Cave 4," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993): 205-19, here 218. This article provides a description of the language of the fragment, which is lacking in Puech's earlier study, "Le Testament." However, Cook doubts the usefulness of linguistic dating on the basis of grammatical features and mentions a number of important caveats (217-19).

rigorous distinction between orthographic and grammatical peculiarities; contrary to common practice, the former do not always prove significant due to the extent of orthographic modifications by way of scribal transmission. The textual history of the biblical writings, too, shows that changes in spelling occur quite regularly in the course of scribal transmission. As a result, such mixed orthographies say more about the preference of one particular scribe at one particular moment, eventually leading to sundry inconsistencies in a manuscript, than about the language of a text itself.

So the only manuscript of the *Genesis Apocryphon*, 1Q20, contains at the same time many instances of degemination by means of an inserted {n} resolving long consonants and a very high number of the more traditional spelling {dy} of the relative marker as opposed to only a few instances of the modern variant {d}. At the same time, it also exhibits a consistent use of {h'}, presumably a sub-standard variant, (23) for the third person feminine singular suffix vis-à-vis the traditional, defective, form {h} elsewhere in the Qumran corpus (with very few exceptions). On the other hand, the manuscripts of the *Targum of Job*, 4Q157 and 11Q10, despite their more recent date around the middle of the first century C.E. (according to many scholars), prefer the old-fashioned spelling of the second person masculine singular suffix {k} in all five occurrences, as in Official Aramaic and the documentary texts from the Dead Sea. Elsewhere in the corpus, by contrast, the *plene* variant {kh} is so popular that it often features as a hallmark of Qumran Aramaic in general. Likewise, the witnesses of *TgJob* preserve the older standard form {t} for the second person masculine singular ending of the “perfect” conjugation as opposed to the *plene* variants {th} the {t'} in other manuscripts. The relative marker, too, is spelled consistently {dy}, there being no instances of {d}. Last but not least, in the orthography, the /h/ of the causative stem is only lost in intervocalic position, but the “perfect” of this stem has a prefix generally written {h} and not {'} as in most other instances. (24) From that point of view, the *Targum of Job*, despite some incidental novelties like 'lyn /'ellēn/ “these” (only once: 20:3) (25) instead of 'ln or even older 'lh /'ellē/ (as in 4Q536) and mostly, though not always, {s} for etymological */š/, (26) would appear to

(23) The similar spelling {hh} is already attested in the Hermopolis letters from the end of the sixth century B.C., hence the difference appears to be one of style. See M.L. Folmer, *The Aramaic Language in the Achaemenid Period. A Study in Linguistic Variation* (*Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 68; Louvain: Peeters, 1995), 237-41.

(24) M. Sokoloff, “Qumran Aramaic,” 751-53, though subsumed under “Morphology.” For the data, see *idem*, *Targum to Job*, 9-24. There are a few examples of {h} in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and, e.g., in 4Q562 according to K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer* II (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2004), 126 (3:3: *hškh'n* “we found”).

(25) 1Q20 of the *Genesis Apocryphon* consistently has 'ln.

(26) The merger of */š/ with */s/ spread from the second century B.C.E. onwards (Beyer, *Texte* I, 102-103).

antedate the *Genesis Apocryphon*. The latter, however, has many more instances of another archaism, that is, the “degeminating” {n}. As a result, these texts both exhibit orthographic archaisms of a different kind.

Although the *spelling* of one individual representative within a textual tradition must not simply be identified with the *language* of the archetype, there may well be instances where one can penetrate beyond mere agnosticism. By and large, the orthographic archaisms in the *Targum of Job* seem to have a more genuine ring to them than those featuring in the *Genesis Apocryphon*, because they contain a higher number of spellings known to be archaic but otherwise unattested at Qumran. In addition to that, the preference for {k} instead of {kh} and {t} instead of {th} or {tʰ} in certain morphemes seems to run counter to the scribes’ tendency to employ *plene* writing. Unless one assumes a *connaissanceur* scribe who consciously applied a retro chic much more exquisite than the one of his colleagues to a younger text, occasionally ruined again by an ignoramus shortly thereafter (hence the hideous vulgarism ’lyn!), a *Vorlage* of the *Targum of Job* still reflecting some spelling conventions closer to Official Aramaic seems to be a feasible explanation. Given the general character of the surviving witnesses in terms of orthography, it is not altogether impossible to explain evidently modern forms like ’lyn as secondary modifications. One has to bear in mind, however, that, as the Masoretic Text of the Hebrew Bible suggests, more conservative scribal schools using *plene* writing in a rather moderate way continued to exist outside Qumran, presumably during the same time.

The *Genesis Apocryphon*, by contrast, appears to be less deeply rooted in Achaemenid scribal practice, because its allegedly archaic spellings breathe a more imitative air. Degemination, first and foremost, is so characteristic of Official Aramaic scribal conventions as reflected by several major Aramaic compositions from Qumran as well as Biblical Aramaic (and arguably even entered the text of the Hebrew Bible in a few instances (27)) that it would be an obvious feature to employ for those trying to maintain a classical style. Consequently, it does not contradict other indications pointing to a somewhat later date than the *Targum of Job*, because it is not an archaism of exactly the same kind as some untypical defective writings. So arguments based on orthography do not possess an independent value for pinpointing the date of composition on the same level as grammatical features, but they can enrich the discussion in a relevant though sophisticated way when they are not merely counted but categorized. A nuanced typology would thus try to distinguish more carefully between seemingly genuine archaisms and possible imitations in light of the various Aramaic scribal traditions. Even though

(27) H. Gzella, “Unusual Verbal Forms in the Book of Proverbs and Semantic Disambiguation,” in *Studies in Hebrew Language and Jewish Culture*, eds. M.F.J. Baasten and R. Munk (Dordrecht: Springer, 2007), 151-68.

orthography is thus prone to changes in the course of scribal transmission, it can sometimes make a meaningful contribution to the dating of texts.

Similar ambiguities arise with morphological and lexical considerations. As for the *Targum of Job*, the conservative orthographic garb seems to conflict with an interesting linguistic peculiarity: besides a number of archaisms in spelling, the same text consistently uses a more innovative by-form of the root *ḥ'k* "to laugh" (also attested in the hitherto unidentified fragment *IQ67* and in a fragment of *4QAmr^a*, i.e., *4Q543* 6:5). The original form of this root, **šḥk*, has undergone an older Aramaic sound shift by which the phoneme **š/* eventually became */ʾ/*, and a metathesis of */ʾ/* and */ḥ/*. In *11Q10*, */ʾ/* after another laryngeal has dissimilated to */ʾ/*, which thus produced the form *ḥ'k*. (28) While the secondary character of this allomorphic root can hardly be doubted, one must be cautious when using it as an argument for dating the *Targum of Job* later than texts which preserve the older form *ḥ'k*. For even if one feature by itself could carry the weight required by a convincing proof, a change from *ḥ'k* to *ḥ'k*, consistent though it is in that text, might have occurred in the course of scribal transmission—supposedly because the copyist was not aware of the difference in pronunciation due to weak articulation of laryngeals in at least some parts of the area. (29) Corruptions in manuscript traditions quite frequently arise out of changes in spelling and pronunciation. A similar variation in the two manuscripts of the *Visions of Amram* (whose composition is now often dated to the latter part of the second century B.C.) supports this view, since the older *ḥ'k* in *4QAmr^a* appears in the shape of another secondary by-form *ḥ'k*, with dissimilation of the */ḥ/* instead of the */ʾ/*, in *4QAmr^b* (*4Q544* 1:14). No doubt the development of an unstable verbal root says something about the historical phonology of Aramaic in Hellenistic and Roman Palestine, and about the extent to which the process of scribal transmission can be influenced by contemporary pronunciation. However, it says nothing at all about the date of the *Targum of Job*, that is, the *Urtext*, vis-à-vis other Aramaic compositions from Qumran. Features like this would have to be excluded from a refined taxonomy of chronologically relevant traits.

While the use of the verbal root *ḥ'k* can thus be satisfactorily explained as a scribal alteration, a fair number of perhaps genuinely ancient forms reinforce the impression that the *Targum of Job* might be more profoundly influenced by the Official Aramaic tradition than many other texts found at Qumran. As is well known, it uses the ad-

(28) See Beyer, *Texte* I, 282 and 584; J.C. Greenfield and M. Sokoloff, "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Aramaic Vocabulary," in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, ed. T. Muraoka (*Abr-Nahrain Supplement* 3; Louvain: Peeters, 1992), 78-98, esp. 82. Kaufman, "Job Targum," 319, suggests a different etymology.

verbs *km'* /kamā/ "how?" and *tmh* /tammā/ "there" (elsewhere only in the *Words of Michael*, 4Q529 1:2,4) instead of the later by-forms expanded by /n/ (i.e., *kmn* /kamān/ and *tmn* /tammān/) which feature in the *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Enoch*; 4QAmr^b (4Q544 1:1) has at least *tmn*. Arguably the same phonetic phenomenon affects a few pronouns and verbal forms ending in a long vowel. (30) Once again, such forms would be likely to be adjusted by scribes. In addition to that, the *Targum* consistently uses the older, or standard, conjunction *hn* /hen/ "if" instead of 'n /'en/, as in the few other instances from Qumran (excepting two passages from the *Book of Giants*). (31)

A dividing line between the Achaemenid tradition and local varieties which is even more significant can be established on the basis of the direct object marker, that is, the particle used in order to highlight the direct object of a transitive verb. In Official Aramaic, only *l* /la-/ is clearly attested, whereas later Western Aramaic, including Jewish Palestinian, employs *yt* /yāt/ for the same purpose. (32) As a matter of fact, this dividing line cuts across the Qumranic corpus, since the *Genesis Apocryphon*, together with other compositions, consistently uses *l*, (33) but the *Targum of Job*, despite its archaisms, contains two of the few certain instances of *yt* (11Q10 35:9 and 38:9). (34) Some of them, however, could in theory have been influenced by Hebrew 'et and therefore do not possess any diagnostic value (e.g., in 11Q10 38:9 and the genealogical formula 'wld yt "and he procreated N.N." in 4Q559 3:8f). In other cases, however, it seems more likely that *yt* is a reflex of the Western Aramaic vernacular, without this being necessarily more recent. Last but not least, some texts have infinitives of the derived stems with an /m-/ prefix, i.e., 4QAmr^b (4Q544 1:1) and 4QTQahat (4Q542 1 ii:6), (35) and thus depart from the Achaemenid standard. Neither feature leads to clear-cut chronological conclusions.

Terminology proves likewise elusive, because the surviving material only reflects a small part of the lexicon of the older stages of Aramaic. But considerations along these lines must not be excluded

(29) Beyer, *Texte* I, 103. According to similar spelling mistakes, several Bar-Kosiba-letters attest the same phenomenon. R. Weiss, "Further Notes on the Qumran Targum to Job," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 25 (1974): 13-18, attempts to identify some other mistakes of the copyist.

(30) References can be found in Fassberg, "Qumran Aramaic," 25-26.

(31) Beyer, *Texte* I, 563.

(32) Folmer, *Aramaic Language*, 340-71.

(33) Beyer, *Texte* II, 93, also detects an instance of *yt* in *GenAp* 10:8 (*whllw wšbh yt dkrwn* "And rejoice and praise the memory [...]" , the {t} being unclear), but the reading is uncertain. Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, does not endeavour to identify the letters following *wšbh*.

(34) For the other examples, see Stadel, *Hebraismen*, 65.

(35) Beyer, *Texte* I, 150; II, 18. Such forms also occur sporadically in older texts; see now Folmer, "Alt- und Reichsaramäisch," 121-22.

from the discussion, because they can affect significant matters of interpretation. The fact that the *Targum of Job*, for example, contains a word hitherto only attested in late Old and Official Aramaic, i.e., the causative stem of the root *wšr* “to send” (32:3: *twšr* “you send away”), has been adduced, not altogether implausibly, in support of the view that this text has roots in the Achaemenid period. (36) If the word in question had indeed disappeared completely from living usage during Hellenistic times, it would have been difficult to function as an archaism. The use of words particular to the *Targum of Job* would thus corroborate some other evidence for a relatively early date. Supposedly, also the employment of correct Achaemenid terminology in the *Book of Tobit*, which is unattested elsewhere in the Qumran corpus, might bear on issues of relative chronology. Such terms include *hmrkl* /*hamārakal*/ “financial administrator” in 1:22 (37) as well as the corresponding abstract noun *hmrklwt* in 1:21. While this might reinforce from a linguistic point of view the commonly-held, relatively early dating on the basis of the contents between 225 and 175 B.C.E., (38) one should not underestimate the learning current in scribal circles even at later periods. The opposite phenomenon, however, is even harder to demonstrate. It has been suggested, just to highlight one particular instance, that the expressions *bny nhwr* “sons of light” and *bny ḥšwk* “sons of darkness” in the *Visions of Amram* (4Q548 1:11.16) resemble the ubiquitous usage of these terms in the *Rule of the Community* (IQS) and the *War Scroll* (IQM). (39) Does this necessarily imply that the *Visions of Amram* are a later, sectarian, composition? Presumably not, because at least the phrase “sons of (the troops of) darkness,” meaning demons, also occurs in a Babylonian magic bowl with no obvious Qumranic connections (40) and is thus indicative of a more widespread dualism. At most, its occurrence in the *Visions of Amram* could account for the fact that this text became part of the Qumran library.

The next step naturally consists in connecting such a relative chronology of linguistic peculiarities with the framework often called “absolute” chronology. For this purpose, datable manuscripts containing a specific feature provide a suitable *terminus ad quem*. Yet in a number of respects, the attempt to bridge the gap between the typological and the anagraphic date turns out to be the most vulnerable element. Here the discussion about a limited set of linguistic traits, as

(36) Beyer, *Texte I*, 282.

(37) For references to Achaemenid documents, see Beyer, *Texte II*, 385 (s.v.).

(38) J.A. Fitzmyer, *Tobit* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin and New York: De Gruyter, 2003), 50-54.

(39) Fassberg, “Qumran Aramaic,” 22 with note 16.

(40) No. 13, line 9, in J. Naveh and S. Shaked, *Amulets and Magic Bowls. Aramaic Incantations of Late Antiquity* (3d ed. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1998), 198-214. Note also *gbry ḥšwkh* “the men of darkness” *ibid.*, line 20.

it has been going for the past fifty years since Kutscher's article from 1958, can still make progress in the light of new material. Leaving aside some nagging doubts about the reliability of the typological method for dating manuscripts, it is not sufficient simply to count "older" and "younger," or "archaic" and "innovative," hallmarks and compare their numbers according to usual practice. Most importantly, their respective weight must be assessed. It has already been suggested above that not every orthographical modernism is equally indicative of a recent date. Similarly, not every divergence from Official Aramaic points to a younger development, since the evolution of language by means of diachronic change is not the only factor which causes variation in a corpus.

Geographical, or dialectal, diversity comes to mind most readily. But while its importance has been demonstrated sufficiently for other Aramaic corpora, a purely "horizontal" perspective does not take one very far in Qumran studies. Past attempts to point out assumed Eastern Aramaic features at least in the *Targum of Job* and the *Genesis Apocryphon* on the basis of degemination and word-order (41) have been unsuccessful, since these traits are part of the common standard language, yet, *pace* Kutscher and Greenfield, Official Aramaic cannot be classified as Eastern Aramaic. (42) Hence, divergences from Palestinian usage must not simply count as "Easternisms." Reflexes of local variation mostly seem to affect words containing laryngeals, because, as has been outlined above, the pronunciation of these sounds was weak in several adjacent regions, including Samaria, Eastern Jordan, and the South-Eastern fringe areas of Galilee. (43)

Given the limited evidence for dialectal variation, social factors appear to play a more important role. Consequently, one has to account for the coexistence of different "registers," such as "standard" versus "sub-standard," and perhaps even different literary traditions. This calls for a stricter distinction between genuinely archaic features which might point to an earlier date of composition of a particular text and conscious archaisms on the part of the scribes. An even more old-fashioned style of Aramaic than the literary language of the Qumran corpus is also attested in several inscriptions from the Persian Gulf, in all likelihood composed between the first and the third centuries C.E. These texts appear to be an extremely close reproduction of the Achaemenid standard with only a more extensive use of *plene* writing. (44) Hence, they exhibit the even more tradi-

(41) T. Muraoka, "The Aramaic of the Old Targum of Job from Qumran Cave XI," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 425-43.

(42) Gzella, "Heritage," 105-106.

(43) See E.Y. Kutscher, "Contemporary Studies in North-Western Semitic," *Journal of Semitic Studies* 10 (1965): 21-51.

(44) H. Gzella, "Aramaic in the Parthian Period: The Arsacid Inscriptions," in *Aramaic in its Historical and Linguistic Setting*, eds. H. Gzella and M.L. Folmer

tional spellings {zy} for the relative marker (instead of {dy}) and {znh} for the proximal demonstrative (instead of {dnh}). In the more immediate vicinity of the Dead Sea region, a number of Aramaic inscriptions from Mount Gerizim, which have recently been published, show that {zy} (interchanging with {dy}) and the causative-stem prefix with {h} were still common in Samaria during the Herodian period. (45) The mere occurrence of such features on its own thus cannot prove an early date of composition, it is only indicative of a more conservative scribal practice. Such practice does not have to be part and parcel of an unbroken tradition, but could just as well spring from a conscious effort to imitate an older style. A similar renaissance of some Old Canaanite features, for example, can be observed in various corpora of Second Temple Hebrew. (46) Hence, not every Official Aramaic feature discovered in a text from the Qumran corpus necessarily places that text closer to the Achaemenid period as opposed to Achaemenid style. For a consistent diachronic perspective, instances of fashionable archaizing therefore have to be excluded.

Conversely, not every linguistic trait which deviates from the Official Aramaic standard points to a late date of composition. Despite the fact that many presentations of the language of the Qumran Aramaic texts insinuate a linear development from Official to Palestinian Aramaic, a number of purported differences vis-à-vis the standard are actually ancient hallmarks of a Western Aramaic branch which antedate the Persian Empire and survived beneath the surface of Official Aramaic just in order to appear again in Hellenistic and Roman times. (47) Such features include the spelling of the causative-stem prefix with {'} instead of {h}, the by-form /'en/ "if" instead of typologically earlier /hen/, both of which are attested in late sixth-century private letters from Hermopolis, and the object marker /yāt/ instead of *l*, which is likewise already known from Old Aramaic, as are infinitive forms of the derived stems with a prefixed /m-/. Moreover, the expansion of a word-final long vowel by /n/, as

(Veröffentlichungen der Orientalischen Kommission 50; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2008), 107-30.

(45) See Y. Magen, H. Misgav, and L. Tsfania, *Mount Gerizim Excavations I: The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2004). Most examples come from the stereotypical dedicatory formula *zy hqrb* "that which offered (N.N.);" and may reflect fossilized spellings, but since many inscriptions are broken, the true frequency of these older variants cannot be determined.

(46) Cf. S.E. Fassberg, "The Infinitive Absolute as Finite Verb and Standard Literary Hebrew of the Second Temple Period," in *Conservatism and Innovation in the Hebrew Language of the Hellenistic Period*, eds. J. Joosten and J.-S. Rey (STDJ 73; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 47-60, esp. 55-57.

(47) Perceptively remarked with regards to spelling by M. Sokoloff, "Aramaic Fragments," 203.

in *kmn* /kamān/ and *tmn* /tammān/, also begins in the fifth century at the latest. (48) They are all part of an undercurrent (in terms of orthography and language) which had long accompanied Official Aramaic in the West without regularly reaching the surface. Palestinian Aramaic, as a consequence, has not emerged directly from Official Aramaic by means of a unidirectional process of language change, but it is, like a chemical reaction, the result of intense contact of remnants of the Persian chancellery idiom with a local dialect which had already been in use in Judaea long before the Achaemenids arrived.

This situation has given rise to the assumption of a diglossia situation, that is, an influence of the spoken, Palestinian, dialect on the more traditional literary language, even though the differences may have been slight and did not of necessity amount to bilingualism. Influence from a vernacular can be plausibly demonstrated if the same non-standard features also occur in other, contemporaneous, sources. What is more, it appears quite feasible that the impact of a previous literary standard language began to wane once the Hasmonaeon had come to an end. (49) As a consequence, an increasing number of Palestinian-like features in the Aramaic corpus from Qumran could suggest a later date of the respective texts. Certain peculiarities of the Aramaic Bar-Kosiba letters from C.E. 132–35 and later contracts, e.g., the increasing use of the object marker *yt* and the decline of the “short imperfect,” confirm this general picture. But such conclusions are only valid on the basis of cumulative evidence, since occasional sub-standard forms may well crop up much earlier.

In a paper which has attracted less attention than it basically deserves, M. O. Wise voiced a rigorous critique of linguistic taxonomy as practised by Kutscher, Fitzmyer, Sokoloff, and others, claiming that the same method, applied to the same data, could yield exactly opposite results. (50) Instead, he takes the dichotomy between standard language and vernacular, as has already been applied, though with greater caution, by Greenfield and Beyer, perhaps somewhat unduly to the extreme and for the first time enriches it by the distinction between an official, “scribal,” manuscript and a “personal copy” of a text which adheres less strictly to traditional spelling and morphology. A racy tone of voice, a broad focus on book production during that period in general, and a thrust directed right against the mainstream opinion did not prove conducive to the reception of this essay, thereby obscuring, unfortunately, also its valid points. Not all differences, it is true, necessarily come down to a distinction between

(48) Beyer, *Texte I*, 149.

(49) Correctly pointed out by Beyer, *Texte I*, 34–35.

(50) M.O. Wise, “Accidents and Accidence: A Scribal View of Linguistic Dating of the Aramaic Scrolls from Qumran,” in *Studies in Qumran Aramaic*, ed. T. Muraoka (*Abr-Nahrain Supplement* 3; Louvain: Peeters, 1992), 124–67. See also Cook, “Remarks,” 219 with note 50.

the written and the spoken language, because some of them might be indicative of various literary styles. One should note that even the Official Aramaic literary tradition has undergone some changes in Palestine, as it appears from a few distinctive features common to various corpora of “Jewish Literary Aramaic” from that area, including Aramaic material from the Bible, Qumran, and other places in Judaea. (51)

However, instead of simply arguing that “linguistic dating of the Aramaic DSS is an exercise in futility,” as Wise does, (52) one should utilize non-linear models of the development of Aramaic and its multi-dialectal scribal context with competing orthographies for improving the underlying typological method. This implies 1) a stricter distinction between spelling and grammar; 2) a more efficient “filter” in order to convincingly identify alterations on the basis of contemporary pronunciation or morphology and against the background of a typology of frequent modifications; 3) a sophisticated appreciation of orthographic, grammatical, and lexical features which lend themselves less easily to imitation than others, thereby account for their weight rather than their number. Especially the third facet of a refined typological method could profit considerably from further work on historical syntax. The latter has so far been largely confined to word order, an intriguingly complicated area of linguistics, but this would be the topic of another contribution.

The case-studies presented in the course of this paper thus suggest that linguistic dating of the Aramaic texts from Qumran is ripe for reinvestigation. A comparative framework which includes the entire material might confirm conclusions arrived at by different means, modify current assumptions concerning the relative or absolute date of a particular text, or identify with greater certainty cases which have to remain inconclusive. Ideally, linguistic and contextual features are to be studied hand in hand, and that will in all likelihood yield results both surprising and interesting. It is thus not altogether implausible that finer diachronic distinctions can be made within the larger corpus of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, including the Qumran compositions. Before such a new, and no doubt valuable, endeavour has been undertaken, however, no existing chronology of the texts should *a priori* be enforced on the study of the material.

Holger GZELLA

(51) Such as occasional /-ā’-/ in gentilics instead of /-āy-/ before another vowel, e.g., /kašdā’in/ “Chaldaeans” in Dan 3:8 and, similarly, the participle of “hollow roots” (/qāyem/>qā’em/ “standing”); some feminine nouns ending in */-ī/ have plural forms with /-aw-/ instead of /-iy-/; the 3rd person “imperfect” of *hwy* “to be” has a preformative /l-/.

(52) Wise, “Accidents and Accidence,” 167.

PESHER AND MIDRASH IN QUMRAN LITERATURE: ISSUES FOR LEXICOGRAPHY

THIS short study examines again the uses of the two terms *peshet* and *midrash* in the Qumran sectarian literature, paying particular attention to the issues the terms provoke for lexicographical work such as that proposed for the projected *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumranschriften*. Of particular note are the ways in which compilers of entries on the range of forms and uses of terms such as these need to consider the role of Semitic philology, the place of context in determining meaning, and the ongoing tension between diachronic and synchronic evidence in the construction of semantic fields.

Introduction

It is difficult to know how to delimit the topic of this short study. (1) In terms of textual profile I will consider principally vocabulary from texts within those compositions that are commonly identified with the Qumran community or the parent or broader movement of which it was a part; this will enable some specialist and particular uses of terms to be discussed, though restricting comments on a wider range of contexts. In terms of lexical choices, I will consider principally two terms that seem to serve rather different semantic functions, both having a discernible technicality, but one apparently having a more restricted use than the other; this will facilitate discussion of several linguistic issues that creators of dictionaries, and theological ones at that, need to keep in mind.

To some extent the purpose of this paper is not so much a concern to give a complete and thorough survey of lexemes concerned

(1) For an early study on the range of possibilities see M. Gertner, "Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A Study in Hebrew Semantics," *BSOAS* 25 (1962): 1-27

with interpretation (2) as to indicate through some comments on two particular items what some of the issues involved in the study of such vocabulary can be. However, in some ways, perhaps the most important items concerning interpretation in the Qumran literature, as elsewhere, are the third person pronouns which when used demonstratively permit the identification of one thing with another and produce a wonderful range of “this” is “that” possibilities, interpretative moves that are highly significant when the dominant exegetical strategy is the making contemporary of earlier traditions. A whole study could be devoted to demonstratives and the various ways they function in particular contexts in the Qumran literature. (3) The interpretative function of those little words would indeed seem to deserve some attention in a separate entry in the forthcoming *Theologisches Wörterbuch zu den Qumranschriften* (= *ThWQ*) but at the moment these pronouns are apparently not listed for separate treatment.

In addition it has long been acknowledged that context determines meaning. (4) For the members of the Qumran community or its wider movement, such contexts were far more than the written data that now survive for scholars to peruse and confuse. It is clear too that words have ranges of meaning in differing contexts, semantic fields that overlap with those of other like-minded words. Nearly fifty years ago F.F. Bruce noted that “while the root *p-sh-r* is not found in the Hebrew part of *Daniel*, the same idea is conveyed there by such common roots as *byn*, *yd'*, *skl* and *ngd* — in reference, for example, to the angelic interpretation of the seventy years of *Jer* 25:11f. (29:10) as seventy heptads of years (*Dan* 9:2, 24ff.).” (5) A full study of exegetical terminology should indeed take account of this

(2) It would be difficult to know where to begin in defining a list of interpretative vocabulary. Perhaps one might start with the verbs in *Sirach* 39:1-3 and their possible Hebrew equivalents. On some of the implications of this passage of *Sirach* for the definition of the scholarly interpretative activity of the sage see Stephen G. Dempster, “Torah, Torah, Torah: The Emergence of the Tripartite Canon,” in *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective* (ed. C.A. Evans and E. Tov; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 87-127, esp. p. 111.

(3) Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (HSS 29; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press), 57-64, outlines the pronominal phenomenon in Qumran literature largely in terms of morphology; he notes that “the outstanding morphological feature of the personal pronouns and pronominal suffixes is the presence of pronoun doublets” (p. 64). On the other hand, a significant start in terms of syntactical analysis is made by Martin F.J. Baasten, “Nominal Clauses Containing a Personal Pronoun in Qumran Hebrew,” in *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 1-14 December 1995* (ed. T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde; STDJ 26; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1-16.

(4) There are many ways of presenting what now seems to be a truism, but the work of Alexander J. Greimas has been fundamental to the discipline.

(5) Frederick F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1959), 7-8.

range of terms and others which have some aspect of the grasping, decoding and transferring of meaning from text to text or from text to audience or reader. The issue in this case is that entries in *ThWQ* should allow space for semantic fields explained through context, space for synonyms derived from word chains and in particular from word-pairs. To illustrate some of the issues associated with the study of the technical terminology associated with interpretation the essay that follows focuses on the two well-known terms *peshet* and *midrash*.

Peshet

The obvious place to begin the more precise journey of this paper is with the term *pšr*, since this is a term used in various technical formulae and it is largely distinctive of the Qumran sectarian literature, (6) though not restricted to it alone. In addition, the comprehensive discussion of this term has been conducted in a previous generation and the complete release of the previously unpublished scrolls in 1991 has not offered new data to demand any significant review of the term. This was partly the result of the original categorization of the finds from Cave 4 in the 1950s. Those manuscripts containing the word *pšr* were put together as a set, grouped after the scriptural scrolls and very closely related texts, and assigned to John M. Allegro. The way this was done can be illustrated from the composition originally known as *Patriarchal Blessings*. Because the principal fragment thus designated contained extracts from the Blessings of Jacob in *Genesis* 49 followed in at least one place by interpretation introduced with a formula containing the word *pšr*, so the manuscript was assigned to Allegro. (7) But after a while Józef Milik came to realize that the fragment which Allegro had called *Patriarchal Blessings* was in fact part of a Commentary on selected passages of *Genesis*; (8) Milik agreed a swap with Allegro and in place of the

(6) Devorah Dimant, "The Qumran Manuscripts: Contents and Significance," in *Time to Prepare the Way in the Wilderness: Papers on the Qumran Scrolls by Fellows of the Institute for Advanced Studies of the Hebrew University, Jerusalem, 1989-1990* (ed. D. Dimant and L.H. Schiffman; STDJ 16; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 27-28 and n. 13, sees the term *pšr* as most characteristic of the peculiar biblical exegesis espoused by the community. This aspect of Qumran distinctiveness is developed in Shani Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim," in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (ed. M. Henze; Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 110-33.

(7) Allegro published a preliminary edition of the fragment in "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956): 174-87.

(8) Eventually all the fragments assigned to this scroll were published in a principal edition by George J. Brooke, "252. Commentary on *Genesis* A," in *Qumran Cave 4.XVII: Parabiblical Texts Part 3* (ed. J.C. VanderKam; DJD 22; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 185-207. Milik had labelled the composition *pGen^a*, but only one section of the composition is *peshet* in a technical sense. It has taken several

fragment that contained the term *pšr*, Allegro was assigned 4Q341. (9) My introductory point here is that lexicographers must take into account the scholarly epoch when the principal discussion of certain terms was undertaken.

In the first decade of scholarly work on the scrolls and under the influence in particular of *Pesher Habakkuk* from Cave 1, the term *pšr* had come to be used as a genre label. The term had achieved notoriety well beyond its humble origins. But what were those origins? By the time Maurya Horgan came to present her revised dissertation on all the *pesharim*, she was able to offer a review of the evidence concerning the term which has served well for nearly thirty years. (10) Horgan began her collection of mini-editions of the *pesharim* by noting that the fifteen texts which she was presenting together were “neither the only texts in which the key word ‘pesher’ occurs, nor are they the only texts that reflect aspects of biblical interpretation and study among the members of the Qumran community.” (11) Horgan offered a word study with the aim of arriving at a translation of the term that would suitably “reflect the correct meaning of the word.” (12) She discussed the four terms *pṭr*, *pšr*, *pṭr*, and *pṭr*, the first of which is a common root meaning “separate,” “set free,” or “loosen,” (13) and has nothing to do etymologically with *pšr*. The semioticians of the last generation have surely taught us that it is problematic to engage on a quest as if words have “correct meanings,” since there is so much range in any one example of word use as the signifier and the signified are interwoven in multiple ways in

years of patient insistence, but now Milik’s name for the composition has been generally discarded and supplanted by the more neutral and all-embracing *Commentary on Genesis*.

(9) Originally published in John M. Allegro, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Christian Myth* (Newton Abbot: Westbridge Books, 1979), 235-40. Published in its principal edition by Joseph Naveh, “341. 4QExercitium Calami C,” in *Qumran Cave 4.XXVI: Cryptic Texts and Miscellanea, Part 1* (ed. S.J. Pfann, P.S. Alexander et al.; DJD 36; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 291-3; plate xviii. See also George J. Brooke, “4Q341: An Exercise for Spelling and for Spells?” in *Writing and Ancient Near Eastern Society: Papers in Honour of Alan R. Millard* (ed. P. Bienowski, C.B. Mee and E.A. Slater; LHBOTS 426; London: T & T Clark International, 2005), 271-82.

(10) That little concerning the word *pšr* was advanced between her monograph in 1979 and her comprehensive re-presentation of her work in 2002 is in evidence inasmuch as she simply refers to the discussion of the terminology in her earlier work: Maurya P. Horgan, “Pesharim,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Pesharim, Other Commentaries, and Related Documents* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; The Princeton Theological Seminary Dead Sea Scrolls Project 6B; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002), 1 and n. 3.

(11) Maurya P. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979), 1.

(12) Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 230.

(13) Cf. Akkadian *paṭāru*, Hebrew *pāṭar*, Aramaic *pēṭar*.

practice and are also disentangled in multiple ways by those who observe linguistic phenomena. (14)

For Horgan the starting point for appreciating the meaning of *pšr* is its Semitic etymology: this is a fundamentally significant matter for those now involved in writing articles for the *ThWQ*—what is the correct place for Semitic philology in the entries in the *Wörterbuch*? One senses in Horgan's use of Semitic philology the end of an era in Hebrew and Aramaic linguistics and lexicography for students trained in the western tradition of Biblical Studies. In the nineteenth century and earlier the majority of professors of Hebrew Bible were trained first in Semitic languages as these were available. To begin with there were Aramaic and Syriac and Rabbinic Hebrew, but the predominant cognate language was Arabic; (15) subsequently the languages of earlier times and more distant places written in signal or alphabetic cuneiform were the dominant cognate languages to be mastered. There are many classic examples of this phenomenon, ranging, just in England, from the inclusion of an Arabic version in Walton's seventeenth century polyglot Bible to the fact that in Manchester to this day the full professorial chair in Hebrew and other Semitic Languages is in the Department of Near Eastern Studies, while the Professor of Bible, required to cover Greek as well as Hebrew scriptures, is in the Department of Religions and Theology. Shortly before the 29-year old Maurya Horgan submitted her dissertation in 1976 at Fordham University, in the United Kingdom the Old Testament section of the *New English Bible* had been published (1970); Godfrey Driver had been the editor of the translation committee and it is well known that the translation contains many Arabisms, perhaps the most famous of which is the rendering of *tišnach* in *Judg* 1:14: as Achsah sat on the donkey, "she broke wind," and Caleb not surprisingly said *ma lāk*, rendered in the *NEB* as "What did you mean by that?" Semitic philology can run wild when unleashed! It needs to be applied with adequate methodological controls.

To some extent Horgan's philological starting point for *pšr*, namely her grappling with the root *pšr*, is fully warranted and remains so. (16) When there is little in contemporary Hebrew to

(14) There are many helpful studies of semiotics in relation to Biblical Studies. In English I mention only a beautifully crafted short guide by J. Cook, "Semiotics," in *The Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. John H. Hayes; Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1999), 2.454-56; Bernard S. Jackson, *Semiotics and the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000).

(15) P.R. Weis, "The Date of the Habakkuk Scroll," *JQR* 41 (1950): 137-42, identified *pšr* as a medieval Arabic term, though obviously his lexicography was caught up in the debates about the dating of the scrolls.

(16) Very similar philological points are made by Berrin, "Qumran Pesharim," 113.

assist in the explanation of what seems to be both a borrowing from Aramaic and an ideolectal lexeme that is a neologism with technical usage, it seems appropriate to turn to cognate languages for help. The danger in the application of Semitic philology to the comprehension of individual lexemes is that what Ferdinand de Saussure distinguished as *langue* and *parole* can be confused: the use of language in a given situation (*parole*; the use of *pšr* in the Qumran literature) is replaced by the system of language itself (*langue*; the supposed root meaning of *pšr*). (17) Nevertheless the root *pšr* is known in Akkadian of the Old Babylonian period, Aramaic, Hebrew and Arabic, and has the fundamental meaning of “loosen” or “dissolve.” The Akkadian idioms that permit a consideration of the term’s semantic field include “release prisoners,” “settle a dispute,” “loose an oath,” “report or explain dreams;” furthermore in the intensive conjugation there is evidence for “unravel thread,” “loosen an evil spell,” and “interpret dreams, especially by magic.” Horgan depends on the work of A. Leo Oppenheim, an Assyriologist of the first rank, to show that the term can refer to the reporting of a dream, namely translating the symbols of the dream into language, it can refer to the interpreting of a dream for the dreaming person, not so much an exposition as a therapeutic release of meaning, so that it can also refer to the process of dispelling or removing the evil consequences of a dream. (18)

As is well known the root *pšr* appears in the Hebrew Bible only in *Qoh* 8:1: “Who is like the wise one, and who knows the interpretation of a thing (*pēšer dābār*)?” The Greek translator rendered this precisely as λύσιν ρήματος, apparently reflecting the root meaning of *pšr* as “loosen.” Horgan has pointed out that the feminine form *pišrā* occurs in *Ben Sira* 38:14 in a discourse on the role of the physician. In the light of the Akkadian data she proposes as a translation of the verse: “for he too will pray to God that *pšrh* [a release] will avail him, and healing in order to preserve his life.” In that way the sense of dispelling evil omens is retained. The Greek has ἀνάπαυσις, “rest, repose, ease.” (19)

In the Aramaic of *Daniel* the root *pšr* occurs both verbally and nominally. It is used in relation to the interpretation of dreams, espe-

(17) Horgan is well aware of this risk in her comments on the possible existence of a proto-Semitic **ptr* that could explain both Hebrew *ptr* and Aramaic *pšr*: Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 234-37.

(18) A. Leo Oppenheim, *The Interpretation of Dreams in the Ancient Near East. With a Translation of an Assyrian Dream Book* (Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 46/3; Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1956), 217-25.

(19) Though it also been wondered whether the uncial ΑΝΑΛΥΣΙΝ was misread as ΑΝΑΠΑΥΣΙΝ: see Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 232 n. 10.

cially in *Daniel* 2 and 4, and in connection with the analysis of the writing on the wall during Belshazzar's feast in *Daniel* 5. In Aramaic in manuscripts from the Qumran caves the verb is now discernible in the *Book of Giants* (4Q530 2 II + 6–12, 14): "The dream which you will give to Enoch, the scribe of discernment (*spr prš*), and he will interpret (*ypšwr*) for us the dream." (20) The context of dream interpretation fits precisely with what has long been suggested for the principal ingredient of the use of *pšr* in Qumran Hebrew where the verbal use of *pšr* is also rare. Indeed the situation remains the same as when Horgan wrote: there seems to be only one certain occurrence of the verb, namely that in *IQpHab* II, 8, the use of the infinitive *lpšwr* referring to the interpretation of the words of the prophets. (21)

As for the noun in Qumran Hebrew it is nearly always used as the key semantic element in a range of formulae that introduce the interpretation of a scriptural text. Most scholars have stopped agonising about the precise meaning of the term (22) and render it simply as "interpretation" or, with a past participle, as "interpreted," (23) though to my mind there is still some room for contextual precision. (24) Several significant issues arise which need to be kept in mind by lexicographers. First, one can legitimately ask what the use of the term *pšr* implies about the object of interpretation: is it to be understood as like a dream? So, second, what does the use of the term in the light of such a context, imply about the method of interpretation: should the modern interpreter look to oneirocriticism in late antiquity or to parallels in scriptural exegesis to be found in authors like Philo or Matthew or indeed elsewhere, such as to omen interpretation? And third, what does the use of the term imply about the status of the interpretation? Is it bound to come to pass, just as the interpretations offered by Joseph in *Genesis* came to pass? Is it to be understood in some way in the light of speech-act theory as performative speech?

Some of the key issues to note in all this for the conceptualisation of a reference tool like *ThWQ* are the following. First, it is

(20) See Émile Puech, *Qumrân Grotte 4.XXII: Textes araméens, première partie* 4Q529-549 (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 28. There are three or four uses of the Aramaic noun: 4Q203 8, 13; 4Q530 2 II + 6–12, 23; 7 II, 7 and 10. For fragment 7 Puech restores the context to refer to the interpretation of two dreams—probably not inappropriate, but fairly extensive restoration.

(21) A verbal form is restored in *IQ22* 1 I, 3.

(22) See, in particular, the helpful study by Isaac Rabinowitz, "Pēsher/Pittārōn. Its Biblical Meaning and Its Significance in Qumran Literature," *RevQ* 8/30 (1973): 219–32: "The term *pēsher*, in fine, never denotes just an explanation or an exposition, but always a presaged reality, either envisaged or emergent or else observed as already actualised" (pp. 225–26).

(23) The preferred rendering of various formulations by Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (London: Penguin Books, 5th edn revised, 2004).

(24) This kind of precision is offered by William H. Brownlee, *The Midrash Peshier of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979), in his preferred translation "prophetic meaning."

not inappropriate to consider etymological matters, though these need to be controlled in some measure in terms of time and space: etymological observations need to be contemporary and local for best effect. The demonstrable borrowing from Aramaic, even if a generation or two removed from subsequent usage, is to be preferred to analysis in terms of Akkadian precedents. Nevertheless wider etymological considerations raise a second matter, namely that the wider cultural context can be very significant for a full appreciation of the semantic range of any particular term. This may be especially notable in a scribal culture whose parameters are not restricted. The lesson of *Ben Sira* is often repeated; the sign of a least one kind of wise literate Jew was international travel and cross-cultural exposure. To confine an understanding of *pšr* to the internal data of the Qumran literature alone is not appropriate, but how wide and far the modern lexicographer should travel to unravel the meaning of the term is a matter for debate and discernment. Third, what is at stake particularly in a work like *ThWQ*? Horgan concluded her reading of the use of the term in *Daniel* with the following observation: "Daniel is called the chief of the magicians (4:6); the mystery (*rāzā*) of the dream and the interpretation were revealed to Daniel in a vision of the night (2:19). It is clear, however, that the notion of interpreting dreams by magic has been theologised; the interpretation is revealed by God." (25) It is thus to be noted that the function of the technical term introduces or rather conveys theological assumptions and meanings which the theological lexicographer should be poised to disclose.

Before concluding this brief discussion of *pšr*, it is important to recall the several uses that imply a wider function of the term than its use as "presage," "prophetic meaning" or "interpretation." In *IQ30*, perhaps a fragmentary part of a liturgical document, (26) the term occurs with a plural suffix, *pšryhm*, "their interpretations." In the light of the damaged but wider context that speaks of the books in five parts, Horgan comments that "here the noun *pēšer* may refer to some distinct works, possibly written commentaries." (27) Does this indicate that the modern use of the term as a generic label is at least in part justified from ancient usage? At the least the grammatical shift from singular to plural permits a collective referent to be envisaged, and it is a small step from there to the identification of the content of the interpretation with the container through which it is conveyed. The move is implied furthermore in *4Q180* where the distinctive idiomatic phrase *pšr 'l* occurs twice (*4Q180* 1, 1 and 7). (28)

(25) Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 234.

(26) See Józef T. Milik, *Qumran Cave I* (DJD 1; Oxford Clarendon Press, 1955), 132.

(27) Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*, 233.

(28) Elsewhere the use is always *pšrw 'l*, the third person suffix implying only a reference to the interpretation at hand.

In addition the term occurs, apparently in its regular singular formulaic patterns, in 4Q159 fragment 5, a small piece that has been the study of a detailed analysis by Moshe Bernstein. (29) The words preceding the *pšr* formula do not correspond with any known form of the scriptural text of *Exodus* 33 to which some phraseology in the fragment most closely corresponds. Against the background of Israel's experience in the wilderness after the event of the golden calf, Bernstein suggests that "the pesher is not the interpretation of a text, but of an historical event, treating the event as prefiguring or typologizing an event in the future. I suggest that the Qumranites ... may have seen in this pentateuchal passage a model or precedent in Moses' separation of himself from the Israelite camp, after the biblical Israelites had sinned with the golden calf, for their own departure to the desert to isolate themselves from the sinful remainder of contemporary Israel." (30) Here a suitable lexical view of *pšr* has enabled a modern reader to overcome the problem of how a difficult fragment might best be understood. Fragmentary texts force their modern readers to leave much unanswered, but a plausible suggestion is facilitated by knowledge of idiomatic usage in other compositions. (31) At the least these last few paragraphs indicate that it is important to take the full range of data into account. A lexicographical question arises: should the surviving majority usage be preferred to other less common uses? In other words, in the light of the data being partial and fragmentary, how do the authors of discursive dictionary entries make decisions about which text or group of texts to prioritise in their presentation of individual lexemes?

Midrash

As with the term *pšr*, so with the term *mdrš*, much ink has been spilt. However, whereas the debate about the likely significance of *pšr* had largely been concluded in the first thirty years after the scrolls came to light, the debate concerning midrash has only really

(29) Moshe J. Bernstein, "4Q159 Fragment 5 and the 'Desert Theology' of the Qumran Sect," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (ed. S.M. Paul, R.A. Kraft, L.H. Schiffman and W.W. Fields; VTSup 94; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 43-56.

(30) Bernstein, "4Q159 Fragment 5 and the 'Desert Theology' of the Qumran Sect," 53.

(31) Bernstein's imaginative reconstruction of an actual separation in the wilderness is probably preferable to that of Devorah Dimant, "Not Exile in the Desert but Exile in the Spirit: The Pesher of Isa. 40:3 in the *Rule of the Community*," *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* 2 (2004): 21-36 (English summary, ii-iii); idem, "Non pas l'exil au desert mais l'exil spirituel: l'interprétation d'Isaïe 40, 3 dans la Règle de la Communauté," in *Qumrân et le Judaïsme du tournant de notre ère: Actes de la Table Ronde, Collège de France, 16 novembre 2004* (ed. A. Lemaire and S.C. Mimouni; Collection de la REJ 40; Paris-Louvain: Peeters, 2006), 17-36.

taken off in the last two decades, spurred in part by a rediscovery of the possible significance of the scrolls within the broader fields of the study of rabbinic literature and hermeneutics. (32)

Much of the debate in the last twenty years can be characterized in terms of whether the term *mdrš* should be understood in the light of earlier tradition read forward, in relation to rather limited contemporary evidence, or in terms of later materials read backward. (33) Whereas the chief characteristic of the discussion of *pšr* is the place of Semitic philology and the suitable cultural contextualization of usage, for *mdrš* the major characteristic of the discussion has to do with the appropriate use of diachronic data, discussion that has the determination of relevance as a significant part of its profile. From the pre-Qumran period the issue is how closely, or even whether, the term *mdrš* should be associated with exegetical *study*. From the later rabbinic perspective questions arise concerning whether the term has as a significant part of its referent, even in the Qumran period, either certain elements of hermeneutical method or particular features of certain later literary genres containing Jewish interpretation. (34)

Another matter that setting discussion of *pšr* alongside *mdrš* brings into focus is whether nominal or verbal forms of a lexeme should be given priority. Whereas for *pšr* there is virtually no presentation in the Qumran literature of the root as a verb (as indicated above), for *mdrš* there are a few nominal uses but, including a few parallel examples, over one hundred and thirty-five uses of the verb in the corpus. For the discussion of mem-preformative nouns such as *mdrš* there is a debate in any case. Some lexicons list them under the verbal stem, while others list them separately, in effect as distinct words. (35)

Before commenting briefly on some of the diachronic issues, let us look at the contemporary evidence first, and the nominal before the verbal. The nominal form *mdrš* occurs but eleven times in the

(32) See the helpful summary of this recent orientation around the concept of midrash by Philip S. Alexander, "The Bible in Qumran and Early Judaism," in *Text in Context: Essays by Members of the Society for Old Testament Study* (ed. A.D.H. Mayes; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 35-62, esp. 35-40, 44-46.

(33) For this approach to debates about interpretation in the Qumran scrolls see George J. Brooke, "From Bible to Midrash: Approaches to Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls by Modern Interpreters," in *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003-2006* (ed. A. Klostergaard Petersen et al.; STDJ 80; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 1-19.

(34) A good survey of several key modern commentators on rabbinic midrash is provided by Susan E. Docherty, *The Use of the Old Testament in Hebrews* (WUNT II/260; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 83-120.

(35) This is one of the classic differences, for example, between *BDB* and the *Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. The latter defines *mdrš* as "study, inquiry, interpretation, midrash, ... written discourse, ... perh. explanation, development of existing data" (5.150).

extant non-scriptural scrolls; all its uses are in what most would acknowledge as sectarian compositions. There are two (three, if parallels are counted) occurrences in the *Damascus Document*. CD XX, 6 is part of a context in which the judgement of the community is described against one who is slack in fulfilling the instructions of the upright: "But when his deeds are evident, according to the *explanation* of the law (*mdrš htwrh*) in which the men of perfect holiness walked, no-one should associate with him in wealth or work." (36) In 4Q266 11, 18-20 (// 4Q270 7 II, 12-15) Baumgarten restores and reads "This is the elaboration (*prwš*) of the laws (*mšptym*) to be followed during the entire period of visitation, that which will be visited upon them during the periods of wrath and their journeys, for all who dwell in their camps and all who dwell in their towns. Behold, it is all in accordance with the final *interpretation* of the Law (*mdrš htwrh h'hrwn*)." (37)

There are three occurrences of the term in *IQS*. In *IQS* VI, 24 we read "And these are the regulations (*hmšptym*) by which they shall judge in an examination of the Community (*bmdrš yhd*) depending on the case." (38) This is in effect the title of a subsection of the *Rule of the Community* which is followed by a long list of offences and misdemeanours and their appropriate punishments, a section with parallels in some Cave 4 versions of the *Rule of the Community*, but also in 4Q259 and some extant copies of the *Damascus Document* (4Q266; 4Q270). In *IQS* VIII, 15, the term *mdrš* is used in the comment after the citation of *Isa* 40:3: "This is the study of the law (*mdrš htwrh*) which he commanded through the hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit." (39) The preparation of the way of the Lord is the *mdrš htwrh*, both in this text and in the parallel passage in 4Q259 III, 6: "This is the study of the law (*[md]r[š htwrh]*) which he commanded through the hand of Moses. These are the regulations for the Instructor..." (40) *IQS* VIII, 26 is part of a passage in which the regulations for the men of perfect holiness are laid out, especially as they form a Council, including what should be done if one of them errs inadvertently: "If his conduct is perfect in the session, in the investigation (*bmdrš*), and in the council according to the Many, if he has not sinned again through oversight until two full years have passed." Here the object of the *mdrš* is not made explicit but the context im-

(36) Trans. Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 1.579.

(37) Joseph M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD XVIII; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 76-77.

(38) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.85.

(39) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.89-91.

(40) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.531

plies that it refers not to the exegesis of scripture or even of a non-scriptural law, but to the examination of other members of the community. This last text has a partial parallel in 4Q258 VII, 1-3: "he should be excluded from pure food and from the council and the judgment for two full years. And he may return to the interpretation (*bmdrš*) and to the council if he does not go sinning through oversight until two years have passed." (41) Apart from IQS VIII, 15 and its parallel in 4Q259, *mdrš* in the *Rule of the Community* seems to refer primarily to the examination of fellow members of the community. It is the interpretation of people as much as it is the study of texts.

The other occurrences of the term *mdrš* in the *Rule of the Community* occur in 4Q256 IX, 1 which has a verbatim parallel in 4Q258 I, 1: "Midrash for the Instructor concerning the men of the law who freely volunteer..." (42) This titular usage of the term is also reflected in two other texts. On the verso of 4Q249 a title or incipit is preserved: "Interpretation of the Book of Moses (*mdrš spr mwšh*)." (43) In the principal fragment of 4Q174 the term is used to introduce a new section of interpretation. After the commentary on the oracle of Nathan has been completed, the new section begins with the term *mdrš* followed by the preposition *mn* and the first verse of Psalm 1: "Midrash of Ps 1:1 «Blessed [the] man who does not walk in the counsel of the wicked». The interpretation of this word (*pšr hdbt*):" (44) This use in 4Q174 has been particularly significant in some discussions about how the term *mdrš* might function technically as denoting a literary genre or as belonging on a semantic trajectory between describing an interpretative approach or set of techniques which in later terms were understood as belonging archetypically to particular genres of scriptural interpretation. (45)

What is one to make of these dozen uses of the term *mdrš* in the Qumran sectarian manuscripts? Since the object of the nominal activity is sometimes undefined, sometimes a person (perhaps as a subjective genitive), and sometimes a text (as an objective genitive), it might seem suitable to attempt to use the same word in translation to represent all the various uses, a term in English such as "examination." The rarity of entirely congruent semantic fields for words in

(41) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.523

(42) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.513. Philip S. Alexander and Geza Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4.XIX: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD XXVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 54, translate *mdrš lmsky* here as "Instruction for the Maskil." In relation to the parallel in 4Q258 they state baldly (p. 96): "*mdrš* has the meaning of teaching, instruction, or interpretation, as in IQS VI, 24; VII [sic] 15, 26; CD XX 6; 4QFl 1 i 14."

(43) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.497

(44) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*, 1.353

(45) Note, e.g., how 4Q174 is the starting point in the significant article on midrash by Philip S. Alexander, "Midrash," in *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (ed. R.J. Coggins and J.L. Houlden; London: SCM Press, 1990), 452-59.

different languages makes such strictures in translation undesirable and this is indicated by the way that it is very difficult to find any single term that will also be able to cover the titular uses of the term in the 4Q256 and 4Q258 occurrences.

Timothy Lim has proposed that for the term *mdrš* there are four broad categories of referents. (46) First there are references to “communal study” as in *IQS* VIII, 14-16, 26; it is interesting to see the order in which Lim lists his meanings. Second, some uses are best rendered as “inquiry,” that is “a judicial inquiry”; such is the case for *IQS* VI, 24 where the term occurs in the construct with *yḥd*, “an inquiry of the community.” Third, Lim understands *mdrš* in *CD* XX, 6 as “communal regulation”: no member of the congregation shall have any dealings with a fellow member “when his deeds become apparent according to the midrsh of the Torah in which the men of perfection walk” — Lim proposes that “‘Midrash’ here has the sense of communal regulation based upon the content of the Torah.” (47) Fourth, the term is used in a titular sense in 4Q258 1 I, 1, 4Q256 5 I, 1, and 4Q249, but Lim insists that the titular usage is not a reference to a genre of biblical exegesis, “but ‘instruction’ or ‘rule’ which the Wise Teacher will impart to the sectarians,” (48) since in the longer corresponding passage in *IQS* V, 1 the term *serek* is used synonymously for *mdrš*. In the joint use of *mdrš* with *pšr* in 4Q174, Lim concludes, *mdrš* should be translated as “a study of” or “an instruction deriving from” *Ps* 1:1 rather than as a reference to a genre of biblical exegesis that is the direct precursor of the rabbinic midrashim.

Lim is right to be cautious about whether the term *mdrš* in 4Q174 could refer to a piece of literature. The occurrence of *mdrš* with *pšr* in 4Q174 prompted William Brownlee to consider that here was the possibility of identifying a genre of interpretation other than midrash haggadah or halakhah; thus he took over the term coined apparently by E. Earle Ellis and applied it to a whole genre: midrash pesher. (49) Although it is not used clearly to define a literary genre, just as we have noted that *pšr* can possibly refer in the plural to written collections of interpretations, so *mdrš* in 4Q174, and even more so in 4Q249, could refer to the group of *pšr* interpretations that are to follow, not just to the commentary on *Ps* 1:1.

(46) Timothy H. Lim, “Midrash Pesher in the Pauline Letters,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Craig A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Roehampton Institute London Papers 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 280-92.

(47) Lim, “Midrash Pesher in the Pauline Letters,” 287.

(48) Lim, “Midrash Pesher in the Pauline Letters,” 288.

(49) E Earle Ellis, “Midrash Pesher in Pauline Hermeneutics,” *NTS* 2 (1955-56): 127-33; republished in *Prophecy and Hermeneutics in Early Christianity: New Testament Essays* (Tübingen: Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1978), 173-81.

Having considered the nominal form of the root, let us turn briefly to the verb. While the consideration of the verbal evidence for *drš* in the Qumran collection is seldom directly applied to this problem, it is the verb that has taken priority in diachronic discussions. No doubt this is because the substantive *mdrš* only occurs twice in the Hebrew scriptures, in 2 *Chron* 13:22, “the midrash of the prophet Iddo,” and in 2 *Chron* 24:27, “written in the midrash of the book of the kings.” In the former the term seems to designate the literary source from which the Chronicler took his account, whereas in the latter the NRSV renders the term not unsuitably as “Commentary.”

The shortage of *mdrš* as a substantive noun in the Hebrew scriptures leads this paper directly to the point of contrast I wish to make in terms of lexical comprehension within the diachronic treatment of words. The question emerges: how can criteria be constructed that enable the modern reader to determine when words widen their semantic fields and take on new meanings? In a widely cited study Johann Maier turns to the verb *drš* to trace the trajectory of development. He is concerned to show that “scarcely sufficient evidence exists for a connotation of the verb *drš* like ‘to interpret’ or ‘to expound’ in early Jewish literature.” (50) Maier is particularly concerned to suggest that Lawrence Schiffman’s views on scriptural exegesis at Qumran depend upon understanding the verb *drš* in the Qumran sectarian literature as “to study.” (51) He disagrees and argues instead that a key text and context, *IQS* VI, 6-8, should be translated as: “In the place where these ten (members) are (living) must not be missing a man advising/instructing/enacting the law, day and night, concerning good relations each one with his companion.” (52)

Maier supports his view that *drš* cannot mean “to study” in the Qumran literature by referring to the Greek Bible where the translators did not use terms of interpretation to render the Hebrew and by appeal to the targumim where the consistent rendering of *drš* is with

(50) Johann Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature,” in *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament: The History of Its Interpretation. Volume 1: From the Beginnings to the Middle Ages (Until 1300)* (ed. M. Sæbø; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996), 113.

(51) Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico: Scholars Press, 1983), 14-17. Schiffman’s understanding of *drš* as “study” is supported by many others, e.g., Alexander, “The Bible in Qumran and Early Judaism,” 40 (for *IQS* VI, 6-8).

(52) Maier, “Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature,” 114-15. Maier’s German translation of the passage is: “Und nicht weiche von einem Ort, wo sich die Zehn befinden, ein Mann, der in bezug auf Torah Anweisung(en) erteilt, (und zwar) tagsüber und nachts, ständig, bezüglich des guten (verhaltens) eines jeden zu seinem Nächsten” (*Die Qumran Essener. Die Texte vom Toten Meer I* [UTB 224; München: Reinhardt, 1995], 182).

forms of the verb *tb'*, "to demand," "to summon." (53) Maier then offers a detailed study of pentateuchal and prophetic uses of *drš* to support his argument. He is particularly concerned to show that the verb *drš* becomes a technical term in requesting an oracle and being told what such an oracle might contain, and a technical term in another way in juridical contexts, meaning "to summon for interrogation." Through a presentation of *Deut* 17:8-12 and its parallel in the *Temple Scroll* (11Q19 LVI, 1-11), Maier argues that *drš* is priestly activity in legal declaration. He concludes that "there is no reason to assume for Qumran *drš* / *mdrš* a connotation like 'to expound' or 'to derive from scripture'. Some of the hermeneutical devices ascribed to the Qumran community do not fit the Qumran concept of revelation and authority at all, but correspond more or less to Christian or/and orthodox Jewish Biblical canon theology and hermeneutics." (54) I do not intend to declare whether Maier or Schiffman should be preferred, but my point is to draw attention to Maier's procedure. On the basis of pre-Qumran Hebrew usage, as he understands it, and in light of how Jewish Greek and Aramaic speaking interpreters have subsequently understood their Hebrew base text, so the connotational use of terms in the sectarian Qumran literature is contextualized and determined. But the question remains for Maier: at what point and on what grounds might he be willing to permit a widening of the semantic field so that Qumran *drš* / *mdrš* could be conceived as having a connotation like "to expound" or "to derive from scripture." (55)

Paul Mandel seems to agree with Maier. In assessing the origins of midrash in the Second Temple period he concludes that "the word *darash* retained a decidedly non-textual connotation throughout the Second Temple period, and it is this connotation that is also evident in texts from the early rabbinic period. An analysis of the relevant evidence shows that the Jewish scholar, who was indeed named *sofer*, was involved not so much in the *interpretation of a text* (the Bible) but in the *instruction in law*." (56) For Mandel the *doresh ha-Torah*

(53) Paul Heger, "The Development of Qumran Law: Nistarot, Niglot and the Issue of 'Contemporization'," *RevQ* 23 (2007-2008): 174, argues that the targum is not quite so monolithic in its renderings as Maier supposes.

(54) Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," 119-20.

(55) On some aspects of the rabbinic use of *mdrš* see, inter alia, Mayer I. Gruber, "Biblical Interpretation in Rabbinic Literature: Historical and Philological Aspects," in *The Encyclopedia of Judaism Second Edition* (ed. J. Neusner, A.J. Avery-Peck, W.S. Green; Leiden: Brill, 2005), vol. I (A-E), 217-34.

(56) Paul Mandel, "The Origins of Midrash in the Second Temple Period," in *Current Trends in the Study of Midrash* (ed. Carol Bakhos; JSJSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 13-14 (italics his). Amongst others, Mandel is arguing against M. Gertner, "Terms of Scriptural Interpretation," 5, who proposed that *darash* in the sense of study and investigation was a conceptual transformation attributable to the times of Ezra the Scribe.

is the expounder of the Law, not its senior student and the community's activity as described in *IQS* VIII, 12-16 is "instruction of the Law." "The essence of the activity designated by the term *darash* is primarily one of instruction, delivered and revealed by one who has knowledge to one who does not. Of course such instruction may include passages of Scripture, and so midrash as a scriptural activity is not precluded. Indeed, the exposition of passages from Scripture occupies a formidable place in Jewish instruction. But these form only a subset of topics that may be expounded (taught)." (57) As with Maier, so Mandel's argument runs from materials that pre-date the Qumran sectarian literature and follow on after it: the debate is a diachronic one.

Amongst those who have had problems with the approaches represented by both Maier and Schiffman is Paul Heger. (58) Heger's explicit assumption is that various terms, including *drš*, are highly nuanced and "that their meanings in any particular instance can be derived only from their contexts." (59) Heger's overall thesis is that the Qumran sages did indeed use exegesis to develop their law, and that their literature mirrors the same tension between the "eternal" text of the law and its interpretation as is to be found in rabbinic literature. He has argued, furthermore, that "a difference was maintained in Qumran between inspiration, whereby earnest study of the Torah would lead to correct interpretation, and revelation, which was limited to non-halakhic matters and to a select number of people." (60) Of interest in the context of this brief study is Heger's approach: the matter of diachronicity for him is one of reading back an understanding from the rabbinic materials to the earlier Second Temple period data and of differentiating between prophecy and halakhah in a rigid fashion; in that way he appears to construct context anachronistically.

Heger proposes that indeed in *Deuteronomy* and other scriptural contexts *drš* must be understood as "to investigate" the facts or the correct law, but he prefers to read *Ezra* 7:10 as concerning how the leader "interpreted" or "studied" (61) the law of the Lord. And for many of the uses of *drš* or *mdrš* in the Qumran scrolls he asserts that in most instances the verb must be understood as "interpret." Heger suitably determines the meaning of the term *drš* on the basis of its object; he argues that *drš* is used extensively for the interpretation of the law, an activity that any devout Israelite can engage in, but it is

(57) Maier, "Early Jewish Biblical Interpretation in the Qumran Literature," 29.

(58) Paul Heger, "The Development of Qumran Law: Nistarot, Niglot and the Issue of 'Contemporization'," *RevQ* 23 (2007-2008): 167-206.

(59) Heger, "The Development of Qumran Law," 169.

(60) Heger, "The Development of Qumran Law," 169.

(61) Heger, "The Development of Qumran Law," 173-74, oscillates between these translations for *drš* in *Ezra* 7:10.

not used for the exposition of the mystical hidden things in the prophecies which he claims were revealed in visions to the Teacher of Righteousness. But there are always exceptions to these kind of general assertions, such as the use of *mdrš* to introduce the pesher exegesis of the *Psalms* in 4Q174. More worryingly, Heger builds a large edifice with significant theological ramifications on the distinctions that he asserts rather than demonstrates. At least part of the edifice is based on assumptions about the authority and status of the Torah as eternal and unchangeable in the Second Temple period, assumptions that to me are largely those of a later period or of none at all.

This is not the place to sort out the debate, but it is important to note how the various participants construct their approaches, to try to unravel some of their assumptions, and to appreciate the complexity of what is at stake for anybody who might try to construct a lexical entry for *drš* or *mdrš* in the Qumran literature, and a lexical entry with a theological dimension too. For these terms, as probably for others, the key issues of definition remain in the tension between on the one hand the likely senses of the uses of the words in certain significant contexts and on the other the appropriate use of biochronic data.

Conclusion

In this paper, largely focussed on *pšr* and *mdrš*, I have attempted briefly to disclose some of the issues involved in the handling of any lexeme. I hope that through the discussion of some aspects of the history of scholarship on these terms to have shed some light on what linguistic assumptions are sometimes made by scholars and to encourage the thought that there can be no single template for what is presented in a work such as *ThWQ* since variety is present in the data at many levels. Of particular significance for those charged with compiling entries for a work such as *ThWQ* are the controlled uses of philological insights, well-wrought arguments from context, and a constant awareness of the tension between diachronic and synchronic data in establishing semantic fields.

George J. BROOKE

WHAT IS THE SEMANTIC FIELD OF THE LEXEMES טהר AND טמא IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS?

THE focus of this paper is on the definition and usage of the lexemes טהר and טמא in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. I have collected all of the instances of all forms of these roots from the Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance (1) and disaggregated their usages in charts. First I will discuss טהר and secondly טמא. (2)

טהר: Definition and Description

The root טהר is used most often in the Scrolls as a technical term referring to a state of being necessary for Israel to experience the holiness of God. Following biblical prescriptions, the people of Israel must purify themselves after any condition of ritual impurity, e.g. corpse impurity, sexual discharges, and scale disease. Kosher animals too are labeled pure. Ritual purity is also required of certain inanimate objects, such as, food, vessels, houses and ritual baths. In addition to maintaining a status of ritual purity, Israel must also be morally pure, i.e. blameless with regard to the commandments of God. If individuals have violated any of God's laws, their guilty status must be counteracted by repentance and atoning sacrifices.

There are two other major usages of טהר. The term can refer to the purity of God and the heavenly realm, e.g. celestial beings and the shining vault of heaven. Less often, טהר is used to indicate the quality of refined items, e.g. metals or incense.

(1) Martin G. Abegg, Jr., et al., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, Volume One, The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran [Part One]* (Leiden/Boston: Brill, 2003).

(2) It is important to note that the inclusion of every instance of these terms in the Scrolls has not taken into account the fact that some of these instances are in copies of the same texts. For example, multiple citations from *MMT* may simply be repetitions of the term in different copies of the document.

Forms

טהר occurs in several forms in the Dead Sea Scrolls: as an adjective, טהור, טהר, “pure, clean”; as a verb טהר, in *qal*, *pi’el*, and *hitpa’el* forms, “to be clean, purify, purify oneself, to be purified”; as a noun טהרה, טוהרה “purity, purification, pure food”; and טהור, טהר “purity, cleansing, shining.” טהר also occurs in two Aramaic texts: as an adjective טהר, טהרין and as a verb טהרין טהר. [Several related roots to טהר are prominent in the Scrolls as well: ברר “purify, clean, polish”; זכה “innocent”; זקק “pure”; טבל “immerse”; כבס “launder”; לבן “turn white”; נקה “innocent”; קדש “sanctify by bathing”; רחץ “wash”].

Verb טהר

The Hebrew verb טהר occurs 86 times in the corpus of the non-biblical Scrolls. All of these citations appear to be in either *qal*, *pi’el* or *hitpa’el* conjugations. Four instances of טהר are too fragmentary to merit discussion. (3)

(See Appendix, Fig. 1)

The *qal* of טהר appears in 24 clear instances in the non-biblical Scrolls. The subject of the *qal* forms is usually man, sometimes woman. It operates as a stative: “to be pure, to become pure, to be able to be pure” (1QS III,4; 11Q19 L,18). The Scrolls contain a mixture of biblical and post-biblical forms of טהר. The Temple Scroll employs the *waw*-consecutive biblical form eight times. The writer of 4Q514 too uses the biblical *waw*-consecutive form (2x) but also employs an infinitive construct with a preformative ל, לטהור, a form common in post-biblical Hebrew (4Q514 1i7).

The largest concentration of *qal* forms of טהר occurs in the *Community Rule* (10x) where it is used to indicate the purification of a sinner. This person needs both moral as well as ritual purification. Although the sinner is dependent on the mercy of God and the agency of his holy spirit for atonement, he receives it only with proper humility and the performance of ritual ablutions (1QS III,4-5). The *Rule* promises that the result of this purification will be true unity (1QS III,7).

On the other hand, the *qal* of טהר in the *Temple Scroll* (5x) and 4QOrdinances (4Q514) (4x) refers only to ritual purity. In every instance, persons or items (e.g. skins, houses, and rooms) are being purified from a specific kind of ritual impurity.

(3) One instance is wrongly placed under the verb in the *Dead Sea Scrolls* concordance (1QH^a XIII,16). Rather, it is טהר a nominal construction spelled defectively (cf. the *plene* parallel instance in 4Q429 1ii3).

The *pi'el* form of טהר appears 43 times in the Scrolls, usually in the infinitive construct, often ending with a pronominal suffix. Characteristically, the second person masculine singular perfect form includes a final ה. In the majority of instances, the subject is God who purifies human beings, especially the chosen (4Q381 46a+b,5; 4Q400 1i15). The point is made by several texts that water alone cannot purify people; they are dependent on God's grace (4Q512 42-44ii5; 4Q257 III,6; 1QS III,4-5). Sometimes the means is specified, e.g. by his righteousness (צדק) (4Q511 20i1; 1QS XI,14; 1QH^a XII,37; XIX,30), or by his holy spirit (1QS IV,21; 1QH^a VIII,21). According to the *Hodayot* God purifies human beings for his honor (1QH^a XIX,10; cf. Ez 36:21-25). In some documents, primarily the Temple Scroll, the subject of טהר is man, usually the priest, who purifies the contaminated person or vessel (11Q19 XLVII,14-15; 4Q270 6iv21; 11Q19 XLIX,14; cf. XLV,5 storerooms), and sometimes it is the holy soldier who purifies the earth in war (1QM; cf. 11Q5 XXII,6).

The occurrence of טהר in the *pi'el* with God as the subject does not occur in the biblical priestly material (P and H); instead, the priest purifies Israel from her impurities (cf. Lev 14:31; Num 8:21). In fact, the scale-diseased person is not considered impure until the priest declares him so (Lev 13:8). However, in prophetic literature God is often the subject of טהר and promises eschatological cleansing of the nation (cf. Jer 33:8; Ez 37:23), an idea prominent in several Scrolls (cf. also Ez 36:25, 29).

Following the prophetic tradition, the texts of 4Q512 and 4Q414, although fragmentary, include blessings to God for his merciful purification of Israel's moral shortcomings. These purificands seem to be supplicating and blessing God for forgiveness of sin (note references to כפר and פשע, 4Q512 29-32,9 and ערות נדה). It is curious, however, that this forgiveness takes place in the course of ritual purification in water and the special מי הויה, מי נדה of corpse purification is used. But, as the purification liturgy of these texts reveal, purification is not automatic with these techniques. It is God, not the priest, who purifies them in water (4Q414 13,7-9; 4Q512 39ii2; 29-32,9).

A unique use of the *pi'el* of טהר indicates the purity of the earth in the eschatological age (4Q391 69,6). The *War Scroll* considers purity to be the result of the righteous conquest of the earth in holy war (1QM VII,2).

The Scrolls writers use the *hitpa'el* form of טהר (15x) as a reflexive verb, "to purify oneself." In the majority of instances the concern is with the purification of some form of ritual impurity (e.g. scale disease, 11Q19 XV,18; corpse impurity, 11Q19 L,7), although one reference is about purification of guilt (1QH^a XIV,8). The *Temple Scroll*, like Scripture, does not use the infinitive construct but prefers imperfect third person and *waw*-consecutive forms. 4Q414

and 4Q512, by contrast, prefer the infinitive construct with the preformative ל.

The only Aramaic instance of this verb in the Scrolls is טהירן. It occurs in a fragmentary text where it probably refers to the physical purity of the priests in their special garments (4Q537 12,1). The editor translates “*leurs [prêtre]s seront habillés et purifiés*”.

In summary, when analyzing the usage of טהר in the Scrolls, the preference of particular authors comes into relief. Of the 86 occurrences of this root, 22 appear in the *Temple Scroll* in various contexts regarding the maintenance of ritual purity. Similarly all four instances of טהר in the small fragment of 4Q514 treat ritual impurity as do the four instances in *Tohorot* 4Q274-277. By contrast, all nine occurrences of this verb in the *Hodayot* are concerned with the removal of guilt from the sinner (“M” for moral on the chart), a feat accomplished by God himself. Some texts reveal a blend of the two concepts, namely, the *Community Rule* (7x) and the combined document of 4Q512 and 4Q414 (14x), indicated on the chart by “MR” for the moral and ritual purity of human beings.

Noun טהרה, טוהרה

The noun טהרה, טוהרה in the Dead Sea Scrolls carries a unique application. Of the 77 times the word appears, all but two instances occur in contexts regarding the ritual purity of persons, food, and details of the purification process. These two exceptions refer to the purity of God. The noun טוהרה occurs in two unique phrases: דם טוהרה, the blood of the parturient, and מי טוהרה, the purgation water for purification from corpse impurity. In ten possible instances of the term טוהרה, the text is too fragmentary to make a positive identification.

The most striking feature of the nominal form of טהר in the Scrolls is that it is used 39 times to refer specifically to ritually pure food. Eleven of the 12 times it appears in the *Community Rule* it is in this usage. Five verses refer to the community’s food as טהרת הרבים, (sometimes without the definite article), and one reference is to the communal drink טהרת משקה הרבים. The *Damascus Document* refers simply to הטהרה, “the purity” (CD IX,21.23) for presumably the same thing. Nevertheless, in *D* there is a suggestion that purity refers to more than just food. The author refers to items other than food among “his purities,” טהרתו (garments, 4Q270 3iii20) and forbids metals used for idolatry and impure utensils (4Q271 2, 8-10). This use of the substantive pre-figures its usage in mishnaic Hebrew, where it can refer not only to pure food, but also to other pure items, e.g. vessels and clothes (cf. Mishnah, *Seder Tohorot*).

The usage of טוהרה to mean “pure food” is not limited to the foundational Qumran documents. The *Temple Scroll* states that the

Gentile captive bride may not approach her husband's טוהרה for seven years (11Q19 LXIII,14). The author of *MMT* too refers to pure food as טוהרה but is mainly concerned about sacred food, טהרת הקודש or טהרת המקדש (cf. 4Q396 1-2ii6; 4Q396 1-2iii5.8).

(See Appendix Fig. 2)

Adjective טהר, טהור

The adjective טהור occurs 70 times *plene* in the Scrolls and once defectively (4Q394 3-7i19). Forty of these instances refer to ritual purity. In three scrolls the biblical priestly command to distinguish between טהור and טמא is resounded a total of seven times, e.g. *CD* (2x), cf. VI,17; *MMT* (3x), cf. 4Q394 8iv7; 4Q414 27-28i3 (1x); 4Q512 40-41i4 (1x).

The purity intended by the adjective טהור appears in the following categories: 1) the word refers (18x) to human beings as pure in a physical, ritual sense, once of the nation and twice of the priests; no women are explicitly mentioned as ritually pure. Superogatory purity is referred to as טהור יותר (4Q274 3ii4; cf. 11Q19 XLIX,8, אִישׁ טָהוֹר). 2) טהור describes the superior quality of refined items, usually unalloyed gold (12x), but also iron (1x), copper (1x) and incense (1x). Eight instances are in contexts too fragmentary to determine. 3) Certain animals, i.e. those types permitted for eating, are labeled טהור (10x). These references are most common in the *Damascus Document*, the *Temple Scroll* and in *MMT*. 4) The term טהור is often found in the biblical injunction on the priests to properly distinguish between the pure and the impure. 5) The adjective טהור describes the purity and splendor of heavenly entities (5x). For example, the angels are "eternally pure" (*ShirShabb* 4Q400-405) and the vault (רָקִיעַ) of heaven (4Q403 1i42) is "טהור טהורים" ("most pure"). In the same sense טהור can describe the purity or splendor of God (4Q403 1ii26). 6) Moral purity is described as pure eyes (of God, 2x) and pure hearts (3x). 7) Only food which is ritually טהרים is allowed in Temple City, according to the *Temple Scroll* (3x). 8) Ordinary cities are to be kept pure, and the Temple City kept holy (2x).

The lexeme טהר seems to occur twice as an adjective in an Aramaic text 4Q561 3,10 טהר טהרין, but the text is too fragmentary to derive any context.

From the above list it appears that טהר as an adjective usually (almost 60% of the instances) refers to a person, animal, or other item which is free of ritual impurity (40 out of 70 times). The remainder of clear occurrences refers to the refinement of metals (12 out of 70 times), moral purity (5 out of 70 times), and the shining brightness of heavenly beings (5 out of 70 times).

Particular scrolls tend to focus on one or more of these meanings. The *Damascus Document* and *MMT* focus on ritual purity. Five

instances of the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* describe the brightness of heavenly beings. The *Temple Scroll* is interested only in ritual purity and the refinement of metals.

(See Appendix, Fig. 3)

טהר Noun

טהר, a *hapax legomenon* in biblical Hebrew, refers to a unique type of purity: purification, cleansing, brightness. In *Ex* 24:10 **טהר** describes the luster and brightness of the heavens (**כְּעֶצֶם הַשָּׁמַיִם לְטָהָר**). In the Scrolls **טהר** occurs 31 times in a variety of meanings which include the following: 1) brightness of heavenly entities (18x). The word **טהר** is reminiscent of the term **זהר** and takes on the character of shining, translucent, clear, bright and glorious. 2) purification from ritual impurity (8x); 3) purification, i.e. the refining process of metals for pure, unalloyed quality and color (2x) (*IQH^a* XIII,16; *4Q429* 1ii3).

(See Appendix, Fig. 4)

The predominant meaning of **טהר** as translucence is found primarily in the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* texts which refer to the brightness of heavenly beings (e.g. angels, spirits), the heavenly firmament, and the purity of praises (e.g. *4Q405* 13,3 **רום טהר** “exaltation of purity”; cf. *4Q400* 3i2, “pure tongue”). Also mysteries of purity are noted in the heavenly sphere (*4Q405* 13,3; *4Q403* 1i19). The brightness of the appearance of heavenly beings extends to their garments, especially the translucent character of the gems on the heavenly breastplate where colors are purely blended (*11Q17* IV,6; IX,7). Also in *4Q262* B,5 and *4Q303* 4 **טהר** refers to the bright, clear heavens. God’s purity is the source of all other purities (*4Q511* 52-59,2).

This unusual form, **טהר**, can also refer to ritual purification in the Scrolls. In *4Q414/512* it is used (4x) to refer to the purification of impurity resulting from death and sexual discharges, as well as the purification needed before participating in festivals. The author of *4Q367* mentions the purification, **טהר**, of the parturient. **טהר** is used in the *Hodayot* texts to describe the refinement of metals (*4Q429* 1ii3; *IQH^a* XIII,16).

טמא: Definition and description

Impurity in the Scrolls describes not only a lack of purity but a threatening force generated primarily by the human being. In addition to the levitical categories of impurity: death, scale disease and bodily discharges, Scroll authors also refer to sin, and by extension, sinners and Gentiles, as sources of impurity. Secondly, persons, objects

and food, as well as the Temple, the land and its cities can be polluted. The holy spirit residing within a person can be polluted as well.

Forms

טמא occurs in three forms in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls. As a verb טמא describes the action of becoming impure, polluting oneself or a second party, or simply the state of impurity. The adjective “impure” applies to a wide range of both material and non-material items, including persons, spirits, wealth, cities, deeds, vessels, earth, sinners and their belongings. The noun, טומאה, can refer to both moral and ritual types of impurity.

Verb טמא

The verb טמא occurs in four conjugations: *qal* often indicates the stative, “to be or become impure”; *pi’el* denotes the causative “defile, pollute, declare impure”; *niph’al* is a passive form, “be impure”; *hitpa’el* can be understood as passive or reflexive, “be defiled, to defile oneself.”

The distribution of the verb טמא in the Scrolls is predominantly among four texts: the *Temple Scroll* (33x), the *Damascus Document* (12x), the *Tohorot* texts (8x) and the *Reworked Pentateuch* (5x). Unsurprisingly, the *Temple Scroll* tops the list of almost half of the total citations. The author is primarily concerned with the possible defilement of sancta and sacred space but also the ritual pollution of ordinary land and cities. Apparently, moral violations (e.g. bribery, 11Q19 LI,14) can defile the Temple as well as ritual infractions. The *Damascus Document*, similarly, presents laws regarding the defilement of the sanctuary, altar and city of Jerusalem, ritual pools and the corpse-contaminated house. However, this text also mentions the defilement of the holy spirit within an individual (CD V,11; 4Q270 2ii11). 4QTohorot discusses particular ritually impure persons and the dynamics of their contagion and purification. *Reworked Pentateuch* 4Q367 goes over the ground of *Leviticus* in discussing the ritual impurity of persons and vessels.

These texts are especially concerned with secondary defilement and often extend the contagion of impurity beyond the simple reading of Scripture. The *Temple Scroll* declares even the man accompanying a woman who carries a dead fetus to be unclean for a week, as if he had touched a grave (11Q19 L,11). The *Damascus Document* considers the one who touches even wood, dust and stone in the house with a corpse to be impure (CD XII,17). According to the 4QTohorot texts, an individual whom the זכ touches (4Q277 lii11), or even those touched by individuals with semen impurity (4Q274 li8) become ritually impure; so also the person who touches the purgation water

for corpse impurity (4Q277 1ii5). The *Reworked Pentateuch* explains, as does *Lev* 11, that an individual who touches a carcass becomes impure (4Q365 15a-bvii). One interesting category is the defilement of holy seed by intermarriage mentioned once in *MMT* (4Q396 1-2iv10) and alluded to in 4Q378 3i1. Overall, the Scrolls ascribe greater potency to impurity than seen in any other body of ancient Jewish texts.

(See Appendix, Fig. 5)

Adjective טמא, טמה

Items in the Scrolls which are labeled טמא, טמה, “impure,” are the following: ritually impure individuals, sinners and their belongings, animals, deeds, sancta, vessels, wealth, and an unclean spirit. Of the 70 legible citations, 57 deal with ritual impurity. Interestingly, 15 of these occur in the fragments called 4Q*Tohorot*; 11 are found in the *Temple Scroll* and nine in the *Damascus Document*. The concern of the *Community Rule*, by contrast, is on the moral impurity of sinners which is also ritually contagious to their belongings.

(See Appendix, Fig. 6)

Noun טומאה, טמאה

The noun טומאה, טמאה offers no surprises. As with the verbal and adjectival forms of טמא, the majority of instances of the noun have to do with ritual impurity, both generally and specifically. In addition to the well-known biblical categories of ritual impurity (e.g. corpse, scale disease, etc.) the Scrolls refer also to the impurity of Gentiles (cf. 4Q266 5ii6). This is not surprising in light of the mixture by some authors of ritual and moral impurity, the requirement that the sinner be ritually purified, and the contamination of holy seed. In addition, a spirit or thought of impurity is mentioned (4Q286 7ii4; 4Q444 1-4i+5viii).

(See Appendix, Fig. 7)

Purity Phrases

Finally, I would like to present a table of Qumran phrases or idioms dealing with purity or impurity (See Appendix, Fig. 8). Those phrases marked with an asterisk are unique to the Scrolls; they do not appear in Scripture.

Appearing only once in Scripture, the construct phrase גדת טומאה appears eight times in the Scrolls. *Leviticus* states that a man should not approach a woman for sexual relations during her גדת טומאה,

period of menstruation (*Lev* 18:19). (4) The *Temple Scroll* continues the ritual usage of this phrase but extends it beyond menstruation to include the impurity of a man who has had a nocturnal emission (*11Q19* 45:10; 48:16). By contrast, *Non-Canonical Psalms B* uses the phrase in a moral sense, much like the prophets' use of נדה, to denote the wickedness pervading the land. The author uses the phrase four times in the repetitive sentence: [היתה] כל הארץ לנדת טמאה בנדת טמאה, "The earth has gone from impure defilement to impure defilement" (*4Q381* 69ii). The repetition of the phrase emphasizes the filthiness of the moral impurity. The *War Scroll* uses the phrase נדת טמאה for the wicked deeds of Belial's evil spirits (*IQM* XIII,5).

The non-biblical phrases טהרת אנשי הקדש, טהרת הרבים and טהרת משקה הרבים refer to the pure communal food. These phrases occur only in the *Community Rule* and represent a sectarian approach to meals. The food belongs to "the many" who are also identified as the holy ones, in contrast to non-members.

Sacred food, טהרת המקדש and טהרת הקדש, is a major concern in *MMT* (cf. *4Q396* 1-2iii8; *4Q394* 8iv4), *4QOrdinances* (*4Q513* 2ii1) and the *Temple Scroll* (*11Q19* XLVII,17). These phrases have a biblical precedent in the late canonical text of *Chronicles* (כטהרת הקדש = *2 Chr* 30:19; cf. טהרת לכל-קדש *1 Chr* 23:28).

Although couched in fragmentary texts, the phrases טהרת צדק (*4Q512* 40-41, V) and טהרת אמת (*4Q284* 3, IV) are good readings and are found only in the Scrolls. They seem to carry a polemical tone, that the sect maintains genuine purity in contrast to those outside of the community. This attitude is reflected elsewhere in the Scrolls (cf. *4Q274* 3ii4).

דם טהרה, the blood purity of the parturient's second stage of purification, reflects a slight morphological change from Scripture's דמי טהרה (*Lev* 12:4). So also, Qumran's מי טהרה is a variation of Scripture's מי נדה, the special purgation water from corpse impurity (*Num* 19:20).

The Scroll authors use certain idioms with regard to purity which require explanation. For example, טהרת עתים, literally, "purity of [certain] times," refers to "temporary purity," and טמאת ערב, literally, "impurity of an evening" refers to impurity which lasts only until evening." These are condensed phrases on the order of later rabbinic shorthands, such as, טבול יום, literally, "immersed of a day," which refers to the purifying person who has immersed but not yet waited until the sunset for complete purification.

Finally, רוח הטמא, "the spirit of impurity," a phrase which occurs only once in the Scrolls (*4Q444*), is reminiscent of *Zechariah*. The prophet promises that in the eschatological age, God will purify

(4) The phrase is reversed twice in Scripture as טמאת נדחה (*Lev* 15:26; *Ez* 36:17).

Israel from **רוח הטמאה** (*Zech* 13:2). The sect, no doubt, considered itself in line with the fulfillment of this prophecy.

Thus, the Scroll authors coin new phrases all of which express their strong concern for the ritual purity of Israel, her sanctuary and her food. At the same time, the Scrolls continue to use ritual impurity terms to describe wickedness, following the lead of the prophets.

Conclusions

Several conclusions emerge from this study: First, there is overall a great concern among the Scroll authors for the Pentateuch's ritual impurity bearers, as well as sources of impurity appearing for the first time in Second Temple texts, i.e. gentiles and sinners. (5) In fact, the potency of impurity in the Scrolls seems to be greater than that expressed in Scripture. Several authors explore the dynamics of secondary defilement, foreshadowing later rabbinic discussions. Secondly, while the sanctuary's purity is of utmost importance to protect, that concern radiates outward into the ordinary realm. For several authors, there is a need for purity of the common meal and/or the ordinary city (e.g. *D, S, Temple Scroll, Tohorot*). Thirdly, several texts mix moral and ritual purity concerns (cf. *4Q414/512, IQS, 4Q284, 4Q511*). Even the *Temple Scroll*, which is mainly interested in ritual matters, explains that bribery defiles the Temple and that a Gentile woman may not prepare her Jewish husband's *tohorah*, pure meal. Thus, sin brings ritual consequences; ritual and moral purity work together to maintain holiness in Israel. At the same time, moral concerns are described by some authors with ritual impurity terms, e.g. **גדת טומאה**, for graphic emphasis. Fourthly, several instances of **טהר**, especially of the noun, describe the brightness and translucence of the heavenly sphere. Fifthly, purity in the Scrolls refers to the unalloyed, superior quality of precious goods, such as, refined metals and incense. Finally, the Scrolls coin new idioms to express distinctive aspects of purity, especially the notion of pure food both for the sanctuary and for the table.

Hannah HARRINGTON

(5) Following the rules of the holy war camp of *Deut* 23:12-14, excrement is regarded as an offense to God's holiness in several Scrolls (e.g. *11Q19* XLVI,13-16, *IQM* VII,6-7; *4Q265* 6,2) but it is referred to as **צואה**, not **טמא**. Josephus reports that the Essenes wash after discharging excrement, "as if defiled" so that they will not offend the deity (*Wars* 2:147-149). For a comparison, note that the Rabbis do not regard excrement as ritually impure, m.*Makh.* 6:7; t.*Miq.* 7:8; it is considered a matter of hygiene, y.*Pes.* 7:11.

Appendix

Fig. 1

טהר	D	S	TS	H	M	PurLit 4Q284	Tohor 4Q274-Q277	N-Psb 4Q381	4Q414 4Q512	4Q511	4Q514	11Q5	Misc	TOT
<i>QAL: be clean; become clean</i>														
Persons	10						2		1		4		1 R	18
	MR						R		MR		R		367	
Kelim			3											3
Animal			2											2
Earth								1						1
<i>PI'EL: purify, declare clean</i>														
Person	2	8	9			1	1	1	6	2		3	4*	37
	M	R	M			MR	R	M	MR	MR		M	M	
Kelim/Rooms	2	2												4
Earth/City			1		1									2
<i>HITPA'EL: purify oneself; be purified</i>														
Persons			6R			1R	1 R	1M	4 R				2**	15
<i>Fragmentary</i>														
									3				1	4
TOTALS	2	12	22	9	1	2	4	3	14	2	4	3	8	86

*4Q370, 4Q504, 4Q424, 4Q400 **4Q393, PAM 43.676

Fig. 2

טוהרה, טוהרה	D	S	MMT	TS	Tohorot	4Q284a	4Q367	4Q414/ 4Q512	4Q513	4Q514	Misc	Total
1. Pure Food: Ordinary	9	15		3	2			2				31
2. Ritual Purity (State of)	1		3	2	1	2		4			2 (4Q284) (4Q511)	15
3. Pure Food: Sacred			6	1					1			8
4. Purification process				1	1			1		3		6
5. Ritual Purity (Laws of)			2							1		3
6. Purity of God		2										2
7. דם טוהרה							1					1
8. מץ טוהרה												1
Too Fragmentary			2			1		2	1		4	10
TOTALS	10	17	13	8	4	3	1	9	2	4	6	77

Fig. 3

טהור	D	S	MMT	TS	Toh	IQM	IQp	4Q365/366	4Q400-4Q405	4Q414/512	Misc	Total
1. Ritually pure humans	1		3	3	4	1				4	2 (4Q284) (4Q460)	18
2. Refined quality (e.g. metals)				7		3		2				12
3. Kosher animals	2		3	3				1			1 (4Q253)	10
4. Priestly Distinction טמא לטהור	2		3							2		7
5. Heavenly entities									5			5
6. Moral Purity (e.g. pure heart)							2	2			1 (4Q525)	5
7. Food												3
8. Cities												2
Too fragmentary											8	8
TOTALS	5	0	9	18	4	4	2	5	5	6	12	70

Fig. 4

סודות	D	H	4Q400-405; 11Q17	4Q414 4Q512	Misc	Total
1. Purity, brightness, shining glory, heavenly clarity, translucence			14 Mysteries, Heavens, Praise, Angels, Spirits, Breasplate		4 Heavens: 4Q262 4Q303 Elim: 4Q286 God: 4Q511	18
2. Ritual purification	2			4 Corpse impurity; Zdb; Festivals	1 Parturient: 4Q367	7
3. Refining process, pure quality (without alloy)		2				2
Too fragmentary			2	1	1	4
TOTALS	2	2	16	5	6	31

Fig. 5

טבא <i>Be unclean, defile, pollute</i>	D	MMT	TS	MiscRules 4Q265	Tohorot 4Q274 4Q277	RewPent 4Q365 4Q367	ApocJer 4Q383 4Q390	MISC	TOT
QAL: Be impure, become impure									
PERSONS	2		7	2	7	5		4Q512	24
OBJECTS	3		4						7
FOOD			3		בזשקה 1				4
PI'EL: Defile, pollute; declare impure									
TEMPLE/ TEMP. CITY/ SANCTA	2 (t) 2 (tc) 1 (s)		3 (t) 3 (tc)				1 (t)	IQpHab 4Q183 (t)	14
ORDINARY CITY/LAND			3 (city) 2 (land)					4Q151	6
CREATURE			2						2
HOLY SPIRIT	2								2
SEED		1						4Q378	2
NIPH'AL: Be impure/HITPA'EL: Defile oneself, be defiled									
PERSONS			1 (N) 5 (Hit)						6
Fragmentary		1					1	4	6
TOTALS	12	2	33	2	8	5	2	9	73

Fig. 6

טבֿה, טבֿה	D	S	TS	MMT	TOH	4Q251	4Q265	4Q299 4Q300	4Q400 4Q402	4Q414 4Q512	4Q514	MSC	TOT
PERSONS (RITUALLY IMPURE)	5		8	1	15		1		1		3	1QH 4Q365 4Q429 4Q513	38
SINNERS		7										4Q386 4Q511	9
GENERAL DISTINCTION (VS. TAHOR)	2			3						2			7
ANIMAL	1		2			3							6
BELONG INGS OF SINNERS		1					1					4Q177	3
DEED								2					2
SANCTA	1								1				2
KELIM				1									1
WEALTH	1												1
SPIRIT												11Q5	1
FRAGS						1				3		3	7
TOTALS	10	8	11	4	15	4	2	2	2	5	3	11	77

Fig. 7

טורמאד	D	M	TS	MMT	TOH	4Q381	4Q462	4Q414 4Q512	4Q509	4Q513	4Q514	MISC	TOT
RITUAL-general	8	1	4		1			1	1			2*	18
SPECIFIC RITUAL IMPURITIES													
CORPSE	1	1	1		1								4
SCALE DISEASE				2									2
ZUB	1				1			1			3		6
MENSTRUATION			2										2
NOCT. EMISS.			1										1
GENTILE	1												1
MORAL IMPURITY													
MORAL-general	1					1	2					3**	7
SPIRIT/THOUGHT						1						4Q444	2
FRAGMENT	1	1	8	1				4	2	4		6	27
TOTALS	12	4	16	3	3	2	2	6	3	4	3	12	70

*4Q284, 1QS **1QS, 1QpHab, 4Q393

HALAKHIC TERMINOLOGY IN THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS

THE purpose of this study is to examine the legal terminology used in the Dead Sea Scrolls. It is ironic that a study of legal terminology must begin by deconstructing the terminology with which it defines itself. Nonetheless, the fact is that we have borrowed a rabbinic term in its Anglicized form, “halakhic,” itself perhaps a confusing term for non-rabbinic law. (1) Further, we are not even certain how to decide what terms properly belong within the purview of our paper, that is, we are not even certain how to define “halakhic terminology.” Despite these problems, it is important to struggle with this topic even while recognizing its complexity.

What follows concentrates primarily on certain parts of the *Zadokite Fragments/Damascus Document*. After surveying terminology regarding a variety of subjects, we will make some general observations on *MMT* and the *Temple Scroll*. It is hoped that further research in this vast field will round out this study.

We have used the term “halakhic” because by “legal terminology” we refer to terms that carry with them meaning relating to the complex system of Jewish law that is found in the Qumran corpus. While it might seem strange to label this material with the rabbinic term *halakhah*, the fact is that this term best expresses the mix of daily life, religion, public life, and civil law that is subsumed by the amorphous phrase “Jewish law.” The term *halakhah* has been borrowed from rabbinic usage to describe, from a phenomenological point of view, this religio-legal system in all its various manifestations within the history of Judaism. In this manner, one can speak of the *halakhah* of the Hebrew Bible, even New Testament, Second Temple literature, rabbinic texts, Karaites, Ethiopic Jews, and of the modern Jewish religious movements. It is in this wider sense that we use this term in its adjectival form, “halakhic.”

(1) Cf. J.P. Meier, “Is There Halaka (the Noun) at Qumran?” *JBL* 122 (2003): 150-55.

In the context of this paper, in which we seek to study the terminology of halakhah as expressed in the Dead Sea Scrolls, the matter is even more complex. We are all aware that the Dead Sea sectarians saw themselves in opposition to the Pharisees and their system of Jewish law. In fact, some of the terminology that we study here is designed to distance the sectarians from Pharisaic law. At the same time, we will see that the Qumran materials display a complex set of legal terms expressing the multifaceted elements of the system of Jewish law that we have come to recognize as Sadducean/Zadokite, as opposed to the Pharisaic-rabbinic system that eventually became the basis of most of later Judaism.

We have defined as the subject of this study terms that carry more than a simple dictionary definition and that, rather, imply in their usage additional layers of meaning. For the most part, these words may also serve in non-legal context, and speakers, hearers, writers and readers would understand these terms in normal usage. However, in a legal context, these terms are freighted with additional meaning that might only be understood by members of an in-group, such as the sect, or a professional class, such as lawyers, rabbis or judges. In such cases, the legal terminology conjures up all kinds of legal detail. We will see that this is the case with many terms used in the scrolls.

To be sure, the legal terminology used in the Dead Sea Scrolls is often related to that of the Bible. Numerous terms are used in exactly the same way as they are in the Bible. Other terms clearly result from biblical interpretation, and some of them may be particular to the Qumran sect. In some cases, terms carry with them an understanding based on intricate midrashic exegesis that may or may not be expressed explicitly in the scrolls.

In order to get a glimpse of this terminology, and an understanding of its complex lexicographic and theological significance, we will select a variety of topics for which we will survey the terms. We should apologize in advance for the fact that it was not possible to develop exact criteria for what constitutes a halakhic term. We tried to avoid terms that carry no more than their lexical meaning, preferring to emphasize those expressing a wider notion within Jewish law. Further, in this preliminary study we have limited ourselves to only a few areas of Jewish law and a few examples.

A particular problem we faced was distinguishing between sectarian and halakhic terminology. Issues such as joining the sect, internal decision-making processes, sectarian penalties, and designations of officials were regarded as outside of the topic of this paper. However, in quite a number of terms we found that there was a particular sectarian meaning attributed to a halakhic term that distinguished its usage in the scrolls from that of the Bible or the tannaim. In these examples, we may have erred in including some terms and excluding

others. But we hope that we will have demonstrated in this study that the intersection of sectarian and general Jewish legal notions is one of the basic characteristics of the sectarian conceptual framework. (2)

One more general point needs to be made. When one looks at the terminology studied here, it has certain commonalities with that of the rabbis and also many differences. (3) It is clear that what we are studying here is the terminology of the Sadducees/Zadokite approach to Jewish law and so we can expect that these terms were used more widely. This is the case even if one accepts the usual Essene identification for the Qumran sectarians, since it would simply be the result of that group's having followed this priestly legal approach. What becomes clear from our study is that this system, already in the two centuries BCE, paralleled both in complexity and richness what we find in tannaitic literature. We approach our topic on the assumption, therefore, that in the heyday of the Dead Sea sectarians, Pharisaic halakhah boasted a set of terms as rich as that of the sectarians. It is only in this context that we can understand the use by the sectarians of what we might term "counter terminology," that is, terms intending to say exactly the same thing as known, tannaitic terms that have been intentionally avoided.

A word is in order about previous attempts to study these terms. Extensive discussion of various terms appears in the works of L. Ginzberg, Ch. Rabin, S. Lieberman, J.M. Baumgarten, Y. Yadin, E. Qimron and myself. Specific lists of vocabulary in Dead Sea Scrolls halakhic texts have been provided by Ginzberg, (4) Yadin (5) and Qimron. (6) Rabin (7) has discussed in particular the legal terminology, although at a stage in the field when he had very little textual material with which to operate. Actually, his comments are very brief. Basically, he points out that there were numerous parallels between the terminology of the Qumran texts and rabbinic literature, except that sometimes completely different terms, more usually of biblical origin, are preferred by the sectarians.

(2) On regulations regarding conduct of the sect's affairs, see L.H. Schiffman, "Legal Texts and Codification in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Discussing Cultural Influences: Text, Context, and Non-Text in Rabbinic Judaism*, (ed. R. Ulmer; Studies in Judaism; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2007), 28-29; S. Metso, *The Serekh Texts* (Library of Second Temple Studies 62; Companion to the Qumran Scrolls 9; London & New York: T & T Clark, 2007), 66-68.

(3) Cf. C. Rabin, *Qumran Studies* (Scripta Judaica 2; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1957), 82-94.

(4) L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976), 274-303.

(5) Y. Yadin, *The Temple Scroll* (3 vols.; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society and the Shrine of the Book, 1983), 1.33-38.

(6) E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harvard Semitic Studies 29; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1986), 87-115.

(7) Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 108-11.

General Terms

אמנה, “agreement, contract” (*CD XX,12, 4Q455 [Didactic Work C] 2*). This term is used in *Neh* 10:1, but **חווה** appears in *Isa* 28:15. Rabbinic usage uses **שטר** for virtually all contracts and **גט** in the case of divorce documents or manumissions. A **שטר אמנה**, “contract of agreement,” in rabbinic usage is “a bill of indebtedness signed on trust (that the loan would be consummated subsequently).” (8)

בית השתחוות, literally, “house of prostration” (*CD XI, 22*). This term probably designates the sectarian place of worship, analogous to a synagogue. (9) It has no biblical or rabbinic parallel.

חבור ישראל, literally, “the corporate body of Israel.” This term seems to be an equivalent of **חבר היהודים**, “the community of Israel,” used on Maccabean coins. The rabbis also used to **עיר**, “the community of the city,” to refer to the assembled congregation. (10) What is not clear is whether the sectarian term implies domination by the sectarian community or recognition of the existing political order.

כתוב, passive participle “written,” in the sense of being found in Scripture. This form is usually used to indicate a Scriptural proof text and, in our view, indicates that the quoted text is canonical, that is, authoritative in the view of the author. This usage is already in evidence in the Bible (11) and continues in rabbinic literature. (12)

מועדות, literally, “appointed times,” that is, “festivals,” often paired with the Sabbath (e.g. *CD VI,18, XII,4*). (13) The biblical plural is **מועדים** but rabbinic usage includes plurals with both endings. (14)

מקח וממכר, “buying and selling,” that is, trade, a common idiom in mishnaic Hebrew. (15) Both of these nouns are found in biblical usage. **מקח** occurs only in 2 *Chron* 19:7 and refers to the “taking” of bribes. **ממכר** is common, especially in the Pentateuch, and means “sale,” or “ware.” The Bible also uses **מכר**, “merchandise, value.”

(8) M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (2 vols.; New York: Pardes Publishing, 1950), 1.77-78.

(9) Cf. A. Steudel, “The House of Prostration CD xi 21-xx 1—Duplicates of the Temple,” *RevQ* 16 (1993): 49-68 and L. H. Schiffman, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early History of Jewish Liturgy,” in *The Synagogue in Late Antiquity*, (ed. L. I. Levine; Philadelphia: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1987) 35.

(10) *M. Ber.* 4:7, *t. Peah* 4:16, *t. Shev.* 7:9, *t. Meg.* 3:29, *t. B.B.* 6:13.

(11) *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (ed. D. J.A. Clines; 6 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1933-2009) [hereafter, *DCH*], 4.472a-b.

(12) Cf. W. Bacher, *‘Erkhe Midrash* (2 vols.; trans. A. S. Rabinowitz; Tel Aviv: 1922/23), 1.60-64, 2.209-11.

(13) See also *4Q166 (pHos^a)* 2:16, *4Q266 (D^a)* 3 ii 24, *4Q271 (D^f)* 5 i 19, *11QPs^a* XXVII, 8).

(14) Jastrow, 2.745b.

(15) *M. B.M.* 4:10, *t. Shab.* 8:13, *t. B.M.* 1:8, 3:25, *t. B.B.* 11:6, and numerous occurrences in amoraic passages, especially in the Babylonian Talmud.

(16) Use of the verb לָקַח in the meaning “to buy” is attested in the Murabaʿat texts (לִּוּקָח = “purchaser” in *Mur* 22 ii 11; 30 I 3, ii 22) (17) and is common in rabbinic usage, (18) but is not attested in biblical usage.

אֵל יֵשָׁא וְנָתַן, “do business,” literally “take up and give” (אל יֵשָׁא וְנָתַן, *CD* XIII,14). *Ezek* 10:7 has וִישָׂא וִיתֵן but reference is only to “taking and giving,” with no commercial aspect. (19) Common in mishnaic Hebrew. (20)

עֲבוּדָה. Literally, “work, service” this term refers to a worship service in *CD* XI, 23 and 4Q266 5 ii 4, and in line 6 [הַקֹּדֶשׁ] עֲבוּדָה. (21) This usage is common in the Bible (22) and continues in rabbinic texts. (23)

עֲבַר, “to violate” a specific commandment of the Torah (*CD* XV,3), used in biblical (24) and rabbinic sources. (25) Cf. below, חָלַל.

פְּתִי, “imbecile,” that is, one who is legally incompetent (*CD* XIII,6, XV,15, 4Q177 [*Catena A*] 9:7, 4Q265 [*Misc. Rules*] 4 ii 5, etc. This term refers to a simpleton or a naïve person in biblical (26) and rabbinic usage. (27) The rabbis preferred שוטה for one who is mentally incompetent. (28)

רָפָא, nif'al, literally, “to be healed” designates in *CD* XII,5 = 4Q271 5 I 20 being healed from the path of transgression, that is, repenting. A similar usage appears in *IQH* II,8. This is no doubt based on prophetic imagery. A prominent example is *Isa* 53:5, where the nif'al of רָפָא can refer to repentance. This understanding, no doubt refracted through Greek, underlies *1 Pet* 2:24-25. Such usage in the Hebrew Bible can imply forgiveness. (29)

(16) *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, (eds. F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966) [hereafter, *BDB*], 569a.

(17) *DCH*, 4.573a.

(18) Jastrow, 2.717a.

(19) Cf. *Ezek* 20:28, 47:14, *Dan* 1:16.

(20) Jastrow, 2.937b.

(21) Cf. *Exod* 36:1, 3; *Num* 7:9.

(22) *BDB*, 715a-b.

(23) Jastrow 2.1036a-b.

(24) L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, rev. by W. Baumgartner and J.J. Stamm, *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (5 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1994-2000) [hereafter, *HALOT*], 2.779b.

(25) Jastrow, 2.1038b.

(26) *HALOT*, 3.989b.

(27) Jastrow, 2.1253a.

(28) Jastrow, 2.1531b-1532a.

(29) Cf. M.L. Brown, “רָפָא, rāpā’,” *TDOT*, 13.593-602 who does not treat the motif of repentance. But contrast the brief reference in *BDB*, 951a. The Dead Sea passages are treated in Brown, 13.601-2 based on the texts available to him when he wrote. *CD* XII,5 is not mentioned.

תעה in the qal, “to go astray” (CD II,17, III,1, 4 etc.) that is, to transgress unintentionally, as in biblical and rabbinic usage.

Terms Referring to Civil law

אבדה, “lost object” (CD IX,14), used in biblical Hebrew with מצא, “find.” (30) This usage continues in rabbinic literature.

אמן, “to be reliable” as a witness, used in the nif'al in CD IX,21, 23, X,2 (and parallel cave 4 manuscripts), and 4Q271 3 14. Forensic use of the nif'al is found in Isa 8:2 and Jer 42:5. נאמן is common in this meaning in rabbinic literature. (31)

אמר as a verb or perhaps מאמר as a noun refers to a court decree in CD IX,10. (32) It seems to designate the formal “instruction” of the overseer in 4Q271 (D^f) 3 14 in connection with the forensic proof establishing the chastity of a falsely accused woman. אמר is not used forensically in biblical Hebrew. (33) In the Bible, מאמר occurs only in Esther (1:15, 2:20, 9:32). Rabbinic Hebrew uses מאמר to designate a “declaration” of intent to perform levirate marriage that constitutes a form of rabbinically mandated betrothal (e.g. *m. Yev.* 2:1).

אשם מושב, literally “restitution for guilt” (CD IX,13 = 4Q276 9 i 7 [restored]) refers to a sum of money returned by one who has taken a false oath to detain (illegally retain) the property of another. (34) It is used in the same way as in Num. 5:8 from which it is derived (there both elements have definite articles) and is biblical Hebrew.

ביד רמה. Literally, “high handedly,” this term is used once in the Bible (Num 15:30) to refer to an intentional act of transgression. The rabbis often quote this phrase as used in Exod 14:8 and Num 33:3 to refer to the Exodus, but do not use it as an ongoing term in their own usage. In Qumran usage it retains its general usage as in the passages referring to the Exodus but also functions (CD X,3, IQS V,12, etc.) to refer to an act committed intentionally. Note the probable clause הזיד ביד רמה in 4Q171 (4QpPs^a) 1-10 iv 15. This biblical term substitutes for rabbinic במזיד. Indeed, this is part of group of terms where the sectarians clearly preferred biblicalizing terminology to usages that we know from tannaitic literature that must have already been known in Second Temple times. (35)

(30) Cf. BDB, 2a.

(31) E.g., *t. Ket.* 2:2, *t. San.* 12:3.

(32) *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, vol. 1 (Parts 1-2; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1.1.68 takes it as a verb (*me-'omram*), but it can also be read as a noun (*ma'amaram*).

(33) For the meaning “promise,” apparently a late usage in biblical Hebrew, see BDB, 56a-b.

(34) Cf. L.H. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Courts, Testimony and the Penal Code* (BJS 33; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983), 118.

(35) Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 108-9.

בעל, "master," is used in the plural to refer to a single "owner" in CD IX,11 (= 4Q267 9 I 6), 13, 15, 16, 4Q158 10-12 12 and 13. This usage is common in biblical Hebrew (36) and regular in mishnaic Hebrew. (37)

גנב, "to steal" (CD IX,11, 4Q158 10-12 4 and 12). This is a continuation of the usage in biblical Hebrew where it means "to take by stealth." (38) Rabbinic usage is careful to distinguish this crime, designated by גנב, (39) from "robbery," which is designated by גול. (40) In the former, the criminal never confronts his victim; in the latter, he does.

דבר, a "legal charge" brought against a member of the sect (see below, רע) (CD IX,3). The verb may also mean to "to charge" in CD IX,6. See also מצוה מות. דבר מות (CD IX,6) refers to "a capital matter," that is, a crime punishable by death. The same usage is found in 4Q266 5 ii 3 that seems to refer to accidental transgression in a capital matter. (41) In rabbinic literature מות is not used in this way. The rabbis preferred דיני נפשות, "capital matters." These are distinguished from דיני ממנות, "financial matters." (42) This may be another example of the scrolls' authors' preferring to use biblical terminology. (43)

הוכח is a term (CD IX,3) for "reproof" in the forensic sense. (44) It is derived from Lev 19:17 הוכח תוכיח. "Reproof" refers to a legal process before witnesses that serves as a prerequisite to conviction for any offense, in order to assure that the later transgression was intentional. (45) This form is rare in rabbinic literature where it is found in the Jerusalem Talmud. (46)

הון, "money" or "property." This term is common in the scrolls, both in legal and other contexts. In the Bible, this is to a great extent a wisdom term. (47) Rabbinic usage favored ממון (ממנות) to distinguish financial legal matters from capital matters. (See above, דבר). It seems that sectarian literature intentionally substituted this term. (48)

(36) DCH, 2.238a.

(37) Jastrow, I.182b

(38) BDB, 170a-b.

(39) Jastrow, I.256b.

(40) Jastrow, I.230b-231a. The robber is designated as a גולן. This noun is not found in the non-biblical scrolls.

(41) Cf. J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4.XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (DJD 18; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 51.

(42) *M. San.* 1:1, 4:1, etc.

(43) Cf. Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 108.

(44) For detailed discussion, see Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 89-109.

(45) Cf. IQS VII,8.

(46) Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 32, 11, Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 90 and 103 n. 39 where the references are listed.

(47) BDB, 223b.

(48) Cf. Rabin, *Qumran Studies*, 108.

Cf. **הון ובצע**, “money (or property) and profit,” in connection with the Sabbath law in *CD* X,18 and XI,15 (cf. *CD* XII,7). **הון** meaning “property” is rare in Talmudic usage and appears to be a reflex of the biblical usage.

חוקי הגוים. “The ordinances of the Gentiles,” (*CD* IX,1 = 4*Q*270 [D^e] 6 iii 16) refers to non-Jewish law, similar to *b. Git.* 44a **בדיני ערכאות של גוים** for the non-Jewish courts, rabbinic **חוקי העמים**, “the ordinances of the nations,” in *b. Tam.* 31b to refer to the sacrificial practices of the pagans.

חרם. This verb is used in the hif'il in a difficult passage (*CD* IX,1 and restored Cave 4 MSS.) in the sense of to “hand over” a person for prosecution, in one explanation, or, in another view, for devoting. Whatever view is correct, the usage here is derived from *Lev* 27:28 (cf. v. 29) where it refers to devotion of the financial equivalent of a person, animal or field. (49) The use of this root in the sense of to “devote” is common in biblical Hebrew. (50) This usage continues in rabbinic literature along with the use of this verb to refer to placing a person under a ban (**חרם**). (51)

ידע in the hif'il refers to making a formal declaration before the *mevaqer* (an official, *CD* IX,17, XIX,22, cf. XIII,15). (52) Such forensic use seems to be peculiar to the Qumran corpus.

ישע in the hif'il followed by **יד** refers to taking self help in a legal situation. It is used in *CD* IX,4-5 and 10 to refer to taking an oath outside of a court, in a quotation from an unknown work. It is apparently also quoted in *IQS* VI,27 to refer to insubordination. (53)

מור. In the hif'il, this verb can refer to executing a criminal, according to one interpretation of *CD* IX,1 and in X,1. In *CD* XII,4 the qal means “to be put to death.” Such usage of both the qal and the hif'il are found in biblical and rabbinic texts.

עד. “Witness,” common in biblical and rabbinic usage.

קבל. In the pu'al, to “be accepted” as a valid witness (*CD* IX,22 and 23, *IQSa* I,11). This seems not to be a biblical meaning but the pi'el in rabbinic usage can mean “to accept” witnesses, apparently mostly with the plural **עדים**. (54)

שבוע, “to swear,” **שבועה**, “oath,” (*CD* IX,8-9) biblical Hebrew. **שבועת האלה**, “an oath of adjuration” (*CD* IX,12) refers to an oath with an apodictic clause indicating the curse to befall one who failed to respond to the adjuration. It is also biblical Hebrew usage (*Num*

(49) Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1954), 44.

(50) *BDB*, 355b-356a.

(51) Jastrow, 1.503b.

(52) L. H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society, 1994), 121-3.

(53) Cf. *1 Sam* 25:26 and *b. B.Q.* 27b.

(54) E.g. *b. Bes.* 5a, y. *San.* 3:9 (21c).

5:21). (55) When it appears in rabbinic literature (besides in quotations) it is simply a reflex of the biblical expression. Later rabbinic texts do use it outside of quotations of *Numbers*.

שפט, “a judge,” biblical Hebrew. The plural, literally “judges,” (CD IX,10), denotes a court. **שפטי העדה** denotes “the judges of the congregation,” that is, of the sectarian community (CD X,4). **לפני השפטים**, “before the judges,” means “in court” (CD XV,3-4). Rabbinic usage prefers **דיין** (**דיינים**), “judge, (judges).”

תפש. “To be apprehended, arrested” (CD IX,19), used in the nif'al. The biblical nif'al has this meaning. (56) Cf. especially *Num* 5:13. Rabbinic Hebrew (usually spelled **תפס**) nif'al can have this meaning as well. (57)

Sabbath Law

בוא, in the hif'il refers to bringing something from one domain into the other, thus violating the Sabbath. Cf. also **לצאת ולבוא** in CD XI,10-11, where the qal functions like the hif'il. Rabbinic usage uses **יצא** in the hif'il. Both forms are found together regarding the Sabbath in *Jer* 17:21-22. See below for the verb **בוא** referring to “entering” the sect.

ביום השבת, “on the Sabbath day,” is used regularly to refer to the period between the onset of the Sabbath shortly before sunset on Friday (CD X,14-16) to the end of the Sabbath after sunset on Saturday night, rather than the daytime period alone. This phrase is common in the Bible. Unfortunately, the Bible provides no direct reference to the exact extent of the “Sabbath day” in connection with this phrase.

בית, “house,” refers to the private domain (CD XI,7-8). Cf. **חוק**. **בית מושבת**, “dwelling house” (cf. *Lev* 25:29) refers to a house in which someone lives, as opposed to simply the private domain. *Jer* 21:22 uses **בית** in this way. This is not rabbinic usage, where **רשות היחיד**, “private domain,” and its opposite, **רשות הרבים**, “public domain,” are used. But cf. *M. Shabbat* 1:1 where **בית** is used in an example describing articles being brought into and taken out of the house on the Sabbath.

בן הנכר. “Non-Jew,” literally, “son of a stranger.” This term, based on *Isa* 56:3 and 6, is used by the scrolls (CD XI,2, 4Q174 [Flor] 1-2i 21 4, etc.) to designate non-Israelites, (58) rather than the term **גוי** (**גוים**) preferred by the rabbis, which is also biblical. But note the

(55) Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 112-13, 125 n. 7.

(56) *BDB*, 1074b-1075a. Numerous other usages of the nif'al appear in the scrolls (*Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance* 1.2.768b-769a), e.g. the use in *11QT^a* “to be captured” (LVII,7, 11).

(57) Jastrow, 2.1688b.

(58) A related term used in the scrolls is **גוי נכר**, “a foreign nation.”

use of גוים in *CD XI,15*. נכר is not used by the rabbis either as an adjective or a substantive. (59)

גוים. See *בן הנכר*.

חוץ, "outside" (*CD X,21*, *XI,5*, 8, *4Q251* 1-2 5) refers to the public domain regarding the prohibition of carrying from a public to a private domain on the Sabbath. It can function as a substantive or as a preposition. In the Bible, this word can refer to going beyond a barrier, as in the case with the city limits (*Num* 35:2-5). This same usage continues in rabbinic literature and often it can refer to the limits of the sanctified area. (60) This usage is found in *4QMMT* B30-31. (61)

חלל. Using the pi'el, in the sense of "to profane, that is, violate" the Sabbath (*CD XI,15*, *XII,4*). This usage is normal in biblical and rabbinic literature. It can also mean "to profane" in the sense of rendering a priest unfit for priestly service (*4Q266* 5 ii 6). This usage does occur in the Bible, (62) and rabbinic usage carries over all these usages. (63)

יצא in the hif'il, "to take out," refers (*CD XI,7-8*) to the act of carrying an item from one domain to another domain on the Sabbath, thereby violating the prohibition. This usage is continued in rabbinic texts (64) based on exegesis of *Exod* 16:29 אל יצא where the qal is understood as if it were a hif'il.

כלי, "vessel" or "tool" (*CD XI,17*, *XII,17*), meaning an item intended for another purpose not permitted on the Sabbath and, therefore, usually considered to be forbidden to be handled on Shabbat (rabbinic מוקצה, "set aside"). The word כלי gains its technical meaning in the Bible in the context of religious law only based on the interpretations of later sages. Their Hebrew continues to use this term to refer to items subject to Sabbath restriction and completed vessels.

מוכן. "prepared," referring to food prepared before the Sabbath as is required by *Exod* 16:5 (והכינו, "and they shall prepare"). In this case a passive participle, derived from the hof'al, functions as an adjective. Similar usage occurs in tannaitic Hebrew. This exact form appears in the Bible (*Ezek* 40:43, *Prov* 21:31) but is not used in connection with the Sabbath. Usage pertaining to preparation before the Sabbath or a festival does occur in rabbinic literature. (65)

מחנה, "camp" often functions as a sectarian term for the scattered "camps" of sectarians (*CD XII,23*) not located at the main center, most probably located at Qumran. In this usage, however, it

(59) Schiffman, *Hakakhah at Qumran*, 104-5, especially nn. 135 and 139.

(60) Jastrow, 1.438a.

(61) *DCH*, 3.176b.

(62) *BDB*, 320a-b.

(63) Jastrow, 1.470a.

(64) Jastrow, 1.588a; cf. also 1.340a-b, s.v. הוצאה.

(65) Jastrow, 621b.

refers to the enclosed area in which it is permissible to carry on the Sabbath. This is tantamount to what the rabbis called the private domain. Those who live in the camp are designated באי המחנה in *CD XIII,4*. In rabbinic usage, this term has been used to refer to the sanctified areas of Jerusalem. This use is found in *MMT* where there is no reference to Sabbath law.

מרצונו, “by his own free will.” This term indicates doing an act voluntarily, rather than because of compulsion (the latter termed אונס in rabbinic usage). Second Temple biblical texts use כרצונו, “according to his will.” (66) Rabbinic לרצונו means “intentionally.” (67) Cf. above, יד רמה.

מקוה, ritual bath (*CD XI,16* [incorrectly reads מקום] and *4Q266 9 i 2* [restored]). In the Bible, this term is used to refer to a “reservoir” only once in *Isa 1:10*. (68) Cf. also *Gen 1:10*, where this word means “collection” of water. (69) In Qumran texts, it refers to a “ritual bath,” which is its exclusive usage in rabbinic texts. (70)

נטל, “to handle,” refers to picking up objects forbidden on the Sabbath (*CD XI,10-11*). Biblical Hebrew knows this word in the qal (and once in the pi’el) in the sense of “to lift,” that is, “to raise up.” Its usage widens considerably in early post-Hebrew Bible texts. (71) Rabbinic texts use this term in the nif’al in reference to the category of מוקצה, items forbidden to be handled on the Sabbath because they are normally used for violations of its sanctity. (72)

נשא, “to carry,” is used in *CD XI,9* and *11* to refer to items that it is permissible to handle on the Sabbath, but where if one takes them from the public to the private domain or vice versa one violates the Sabbath. This usage, in connection with the Sabbath, is biblical (*Jer 17:21*). It seems not to be used by the rabbis in this connection.

עיר. The “city” refers to the area of the city limits as defined regarding the rules for travel on the Sabbath (*CD X,21, XI,3*). The text prescribes distances of 1000 and 2000 cubits beyond the city limits that it is permissible to walk for specific purposes. (73) חוץ מעיר, literally, “outside of the city,” refers to the area beyond the city limits. This is biblical usage (*Num 35:4-5*) in a passage that serves for the sectarians and the rabbis as the basis for determining the Sabbath limit (תחום שבת).

עשה, “to do, make,” followed by מלאכה refers to performing forbidden labors on the Sabbath (*CD X,14-15*). This usage is biblical.

(66) *BDB*, 953b.

(67) Jastrow, 2.1492b.

(68) We omit here from consideration the homonym meaning, “hope.”

(69) Cf. Targumim.

(70) Jastrow, 2.829.

(71) *DCH*, 5.676a-b.

(72) Jastrow, 2.900a.

(73) Cf. Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 90-98, 111-13.

Cf. *Exod* 19:10, לֹא תַעֲשֶׂה, “you may not do,” referring to forbidden labor on the Sabbath. Also biblical (cf. *Isa* 58:13) is the use with חַפְצּוֹ to refer to doing one’s “business” on the Sabbath (*CD* XI,2).

שַׁבַּת, “to spend the Sabbath” (*CD* XI,14), is biblical (74) and continues in rabbinic usage. (75) In the latter it can refer to the official residence place (שְׁבִיתָה) for determining how far a person may walk on the Sabbath.

שָׁמַר, “to observe,” in the sense of fulfilling the requirements of Sabbath law. This usage is based on *Deut* 5:12, explicitly quoted in *CD* X,15-16. This usage continues in rabbinic Hebrew. (76)

Terms Related to Purity and Impurity.

נָאֵל, “To become impure” (*CD* XII,16, 4Q266 9 ii 3). This is a rare usage in the Bible, specifically in late biblical Hebrew, (77) and is not used in rabbinic literature.

דִּי מַרְעִיל, sufficient water to cover a person (*CD* X,11, 13). This usage is not found in biblical Hebrew. Its definition is based on a very rare rabbinic usage. (78)

הִטְהָר. Noun, *hitaher*, derived from the *nif'al*, “purification” (*CD* X,10, 4Q270 6 iv 20). We do not take it as *ha-tohar*, “the purification,” since all other occurrences are spelled *plene waw*. (79) While this is a common root in biblical and rabbinic usage, this noun form is not used in either.

טָהַר. To purify, used in all conjugations in biblical, Qumran and rabbinic Hebrew.

טָמֵא. This verb is used as in biblical usage. טָמֵא כְבוֹס, refers to one “in a state of impurity requiring washing” (*CD* XI,22, 4Q271 [4QD^f] 5 i 15) such as after a seminal emission. (80) The noun כְבוֹס does not occur in the Bible. The root כָּבַס often appears with רָחַץ in commands to launder (כָּבַס) the clothes and bathe (רָחַץ) the body, probably referring to immersion as understood by the later commentators. כִּיבוֹס occurs as a noun in rabbinic Hebrew. (81)

טָמְאוּת, forms of ritual impurity (*CD* XI,20). This is common usage (vocalized *tum'ot*) in biblical and rabbinic Hebrew. Qimron vocalizes *tim'ot*. (82)

(74) *BDB*, 991b.

(75) Jastrow, 2.1519b-1520a.

(76) Jastrow, 2.1600b.

(77) *BDB*, 146a.

(78) S. Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York: Philipp Feldheim, 1956), 135 n. 151.

(79) *Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance*, 1.1.283b-284a.

(80) Rabin, *Zadokite Documents*, 59. See the contribution by Harrington above, 99-114.

(81) Jastrow, 1.630b.

(82) Qimron, *Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 100.2 (p. 17), 500.2 (p. 100).

כלי, "vessel," here referring to a container that is susceptible to ritual impurity because it can indeed contain a solid or liquid and because it is a finished item. This is common usage in biblical and rabbinic texts. כלי מעשה (CD XII,18) refers to a "working tool" or "usable vessel," based on *Lev* 11:32. Such vessels are subject to ritual impurity.

מי כלי, spelled מה in CD X,12, cf. also X,14, "the waters of a vessel." This term designates water that has been drawn and, therefore, which may not be used for ritual purification. This term replaces rabbinic מים שאובים, "drawn water."

נגע, impurity resulting from "skin disease" (CD XIII,5). This is common in biblical and rabbinic Hebrew. תורת נגע, "the law of skin diseases" (CD XIII,5) is biblical usage (*Lev* 13:59, cf. 14:32). Qumran texts often have the pl. גועים or גניעים. (83)

נדה. In the scrolls, following biblical Hebrew, this term denotes any form of impurity (e.g. CD XII,2), but also can refer, more particularly, to menstrual impurity. In rabbinic usage, it refers only to menstrual impurity. (84) מי נדה, "waters of purification," refers to waters mixed with the ashes of the red heifer in *11QT^a* XLIV,18 (as in *Num* 19:9, 13, 20, 31:23). The same term is used for the water used for purification of seminal impurity in 4Q284 (*Purification Liturgy*) 17.

עגלי הדבורים, "larvae of bees," forbidden to be eaten by the sectarians (CD XII,12). It is possible to emend the 'ayin to a resh, reading רגלי and translate, "the legs of bees." Most probable is to explain this term based on an obscure Syriac usage, 'egle de-debburiyatha, "larvae of the bees." (85) This view is followed also by S. Lieberman, (86) who notes that the word is most probably a hapax legomenon.

עיר המקדש, "city of the sanctuary." CD XII,1-2 (twice) (87) and *11QT^a* (passim) use עיר המקדש, "the City of the Sanctuary," to refer to the temenos, (88) although some scholars understand it to refer to the entire city of Jerusalem. (89) This term occurs once in the Bible and never in rabbinic literature that prefers הר הבית, "the Temple Mount," assuming our interpretation to be correct.

(83) *Ibid.*, 330.1d (p. 66).

(84) Jastrow, 2.878a.

(85) Ginzberg, *Unknown Jewish Sect*, 78-9.

(86) S. Lieberman, "Light on the Cave Scrolls from Rabbinic Sources," *PAAJR* 20 (1951): 395-404. Repr. S. Lieberman, *Texts and Studies* (New York: Ktav, 1974) 190-99.

"Light", 397-398.

(87) Cf. also CD XX,22, עיר הקדש.

(88) B. A. Levine, "The Temple Scroll: Aspects of its Historical Provenance and Literary Character," *BASOR* 232 (1978): 5-23.

(89) Yadin, *Temple Scroll* 1.415-16.

שכב, “to lie,” in the technical sense of “to have sexual relations.” This term continues biblical usage, (90) but other terms are used by the rabbis. In rabbinic Hebrew, the *qal* of this verb means only “lie down, go to sleep.” The *nif'al* and *hif'il* use the verb in the sense of being subjected to or causing homosexual relations or bestiality. (91) These are clearly reflexes of biblical usage.

Terms with sectarian relevance

באי הברית, e.g., *CD* VI,19 (emended from ביאו הברית in *CD* IX,3), refers to “those who have entered the covenant,” the members of the sect. Such people have full legal status in the sect’s legal system. This verb is often used for entering the covenant in biblical and scrolls texts. (92) However, בברית אברהם ... אשר באו “who have entered... the covenant of Abraham” in *CD* XII,11 refers to those who have entered the Jewish people. Both sectarian usages are based on the biblical use of this expression to refer to entering a covenant. בוא can be used in tannaitic literature for entering the *ḥavurah*, a group of pietists associated by modern scholars with the pharisaic sages. (93)

בוא אל הקהל. Literally, “enter the congregation.” This term seems to refer to reentering the sect after a period of punishment. If so, it has been changed from its original biblical meaning. Cf. *Deut* 23:2-3 where it refers to entry into the congregation, taken by the tannaim as referring to marriage with free, native-born Israelites. The term קהל continues in this usage in rabbinic literature. (94)

טהרה, pure solid food of the communal meals of the sect. (95) There is no biblical or rabbinic parallel to this usage. (96)

יצב. In the *hitpa'el*, this root means literally, “to take a stand, or position,” and refers (e.g., *CD* X,7, *IQSa* I,11, 14) to being appointed and serving in a specified formal capacity in the life of the sect. While this verb occurs in biblical and rabbinic literature it is not used to indicate holding office. (97)

ירא את אל, “who fears God” (*CD* X,2). This clause appears to refer to one who is a full-fledged member of the sect, and seems to

(90) *BDB*, 1012a, definition 3.

(91) Jastrow, 2.1570b-1571a.

(92) *DCH*, 2.265a including numerous Qumran examples.

(93) S. Lieberman, “The Discipline in the So-Called Dead Sea Manual of Discipline,” *JBL* 71 (1951): 202. Repr. S. Lieberman, *Texts and Studies* (New York: Ktav, 1974), 203.

(94) Jastrow, 2.1322b.

(95) Cf. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 162-5.

(96) Cf. *DCH*, 3.348b where they list Qumran examples but no biblical uses.

(97) Cf. *DCH*, 4.365a-b where many Qumran usages are listed, but this definition is not specified.

imply that only members of the sect may be accepted as witnesses. (98) The Bible uses the root ירא with divine names to indicate fear of God, (99) but the rabbis prefer to substitute a euphemism for the divine name and use ירא שמים, "one who fears heaven." (100)

כף לכף, literally "palm to palm," that is, in cash. Cf. *Ezek* 21:19, 22, כף אל כף, but the meaning of this phrase does not correspond. No parallel can be found in biblical or rabbinic literature.

מאד, "property" in מאד המחנה, "property of the camp" that is of the sectarian sub-community (*CD* IX,11) and other expressions in Qumran texts. (101) This rare use as a noun occurs in the Bible (*Deut* 6:5, so Targumim), but is not continued in rabbinic usage.

מצוה, "commandment" literally, refers to the legal views of the Qumran sect. (102) One part of that legal system may be termed דבר מן המצוה (*CD* X,3). In the Bible מצוה is a general term deriving from the verb צוה, "to command." Sectarian and rabbinic usages derive from the biblical noun in the sense of "commandment" of God. A parallel notion to that of the scrolls is the rabbinic use of this word to refer to the oral law as a whole or some component of it.

מעל, "to transgress." In Qumran usage (e.g., *CD* IX,16, XV,13), this term seems to refer to transgressions against the Torah, regardless of whether they concern particular sectarian regulations or not. In biblical use, this verb may refer to acting treacherously or misappropriating sancta. (103) In rabbinic usage this term refers to violations of sancta only, but this particular usage seems to be absent in the scrolls.

משפט, "regulation," refers to the legal views of the Qumran sect. (104) The term is used in this manner regarding Sabbath regulations in *CD* X,14 and for אוב וידעוני in *CD* XII,3. In *CD* IX,20 this noun refers to a verdict that can be sealed (שלם), meaning that there is sufficient proof to effect the punishment. This word is common in the meanings of "judgment = verdict" and "ordinance, regulation" in biblical Hebrew. (105) In rabbinic texts, it refers either to a "sentence" or to what we would term civil law. (106)

משקה, referring to the pure "drink" of the sect (*IQS* VI,20, VII,20 [corrected in the MS.], *4Q284a* 1:3, etc.). It may also refer to liquids that come from fruit (*4Q284a* [Harvesting] 1:5, etc.). In the Bible this word refers to irrigation or liquid for drinking, (107) and in

(98) Cf. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 60.

(99) *BDB*, 431b.

(100) Jastrow, 1.593b.

(101) *DCH*, 5.107a.

(102) Cf. Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 46-49.

(103) *BDB*, 591a; cf. J. Milgrom, "The Concept of Ma'al in the Bible and the Ancient Near East," *JAOS* 96 (1976): 236-47.

(104) Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 42-47.

(105) *BDB*, 1048b-1049a

(106) Jastrow, 857b.

(107) *BDB*, 1052b.

rabbinic literature it usually designates those liquids contact with which renders solids susceptible to ritual impurity. (108)

נגלה, “revealed,” also in the pl. (נגלות), referring to laws found in the Bible and known to all Jews (*IQS* V,12, IX,13, etc.). (109) There is no parallel to this special usage in biblical or rabbinic literature. Cf., however, *Deut* 29:28. In both of these corpora it simply refers to that which is revealed, as opposed to hidden. (110)

נסתר, “hidden,” often pl. נסתרות, referring to laws derived by the sectarians in study sessions (e.g., *CD* V,11, III,14). They regarded these laws as developed under ongoing divine inspiration, a type of continuous revelation. (111) There is no parallel to this usage in biblical (112) or rabbinic literature, (113) although the form occurs. It simply refers to that which is hidden or concealed. Cf., however, *Deut* 29:28 and note the use of נסתרות for “mysteries” in a *Ben Sira* text (3:22) quoted by the rabbis (*b. Hag.* 13a).

סרך, “a list,” denoting either a list of regulations or of the members of the community. As a list of regulations, this term refers to regulations assembled at sectarian study sessions into mini-codes, and then redacted into larger codes. (114) This usage is found only in Qumran literature. Biblical Aramaic סרכין (*Dan* 6:3-5), sing. סרך, derives from Persian *sarak* and refers to an “officer” or “official.” (115) Talmudic סרך is derived from Hebrew שרך (spelled with *sin*), meaning “twist” or “tie.” But the Qumran Hebrew term סרך, “rule, list of rules, list,” seems to be derived from the Aramaic (Persian) word for “official,” that is, “one who orders.”

עבר על הפקודים. “To pass muster,” that is, to be over twenty years old—the age of majority (*CD* 1X,1-2 and XV,6, etc.). (116) This phrase is biblical (cf. *Exod* 30:14) and is not used by the rabbis.

עדה, the sectarian “congregation.” This term is derived from the root יעד, “gather, assemble.” In the scrolls, עדה refers to the community in the present age (e.g. *CD* X,4) or in the end of days (e.g., *CD* VII,20). This word is common in the Bible to designate the “community” of Israel in the desert. (117) It is not used in rabbinic Hebrew except as a reflex of the Bible. (118)

(108) Although this definition is not mentioned in Jastrow, 2.858a.

(109) Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 52-32.

(110) *BDB*, 163a, forms of the *nif'al*. Later use of this term for the non-mystical aspects of Judaism is not relevant here.

(111) Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 52-32. Later use of this term to refer to Kabbalistic traditions is not relevant here.

(112) *BDB*, 711a-b, *nif'al* forms.

(113) Jastrow, 2.1032b-1033a.

(114) Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 60-68.

(115) *BDB*, 1104b.

(116) Cf. Schiffman, *Sectarian Law*, 55-58.

(117) *BDB*, 417a.

(118) Cf. the examples in Jastrow, 2.1043a.

עצה, "counsel." This term refers to decisions made by the sectarian community and their assembly (*IQS* VI,4), as well as to the sect's council (*IQS* VIII,24) or membership (*IQS* V,7), or as in *CD* 1XII,8 where it may refer to the entire community of Israel. These usages are not found either in the Bible or rabbinic literature.

עת ועת, "for each and every time," or "for every occasion" (*CD* XII,21). Also appears as עת בעת (*IQS* IX,13). This phrase modifies משפט and indicates the regulation applicable in any specific period. This expression seems to imply change in the law over time, to accord with circumstances. (119) This locution does not occur in biblical or rabbinic literature, although the word עת does.

פרוש התורה, "the interpretation of the Torah," referring to the sectarian understanding of the law. (120) The meaning "to interpret" for the verb פרש in the pi'el is postbiblical and is used extensively in rabbinic literature. (121)

רע. This term, from the root רעה, "to associate with," is used in the Bible to refer to a fellow Israelite of full legal status (122) as well as to a "friend" or "lover." It appears, however, that its use in the scrolls (e.g., *CD* IX,17, X,2) implies status as a member of the sect. This particular usage is not found in rabbinic literature where this noun designates only a "friend" or "beloved spouse." (123)

While these lists can be greatly expanded and improved for the *Zadokite Fragments* (*Damascus Document*) and the bulk of the smaller halakhic texts, we need to note here, before drawing conclusions, that the nature of the terms in the *Temple Scroll* and *4QMMT* is somewhat different. The vast majority of terms used in the *Temple Scroll* are simply quotations or adaptations of the Hebrew Bible. Other non-Hebrew Bible usages have been briefly studied by Yadin. In this context, he lists some eighteen terms that refer to the Temple, but do not occur in the Bible, but do occur in mishnaic Hebrew. Seventeen more examples of phraseology "which bears on halakhic matters" are listed also by him. He especially emphasizes four uses of טהרה that are characteristic of mishnaic usage. (I omit here usages not pertaining to halakhic issues.) Finally, he notes thirteen usages based on a Second Temple usage, some parallel to other scrolls, of which ten are halakhic. (124)

All in all, then, study of the *Temple Scroll's* halakhic terms will yield a long list of biblical terms in continued use, and a number of terms known only from rabbinic literature or from other scrolls, the latter being the shorter list.

(119) Cf. Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 25 n. 25.

(120) Cf. Schiffman, *Halakhah at Qumran*, 35-41.

(121) Jastrow, 2.1242a-b, definition 5 under pi'el.

(122) *BDB*, 946a, definition 2.

(123) Jastrow, 2.1475b-1476a.

(124) Yadin, *Temple Scroll* 1.35-38.

In discussing *MMT*, E. Qimron has examined its vocabulary. (125) He sees it as including many mishnaic elements. We should note in passing that this is the case with the *Copper Scroll*. (126) *MMT* displays numerous biblical terms as well as quite a few neologisms and quite a number of usages in agreement with mishnaic Hebrew. Indeed, some terms that are discussed above are also in use in *MMT*. It is clear that we will have to subject the halakhic terms in *Temple Scroll* and *4QMMT* to detailed study as we expand our research.

Conclusions

The conclusions that follow will relate to the terms in the *Damascus Document* that have been studied above in detail. Nonetheless, they will seem prosaic, perhaps totally expected.

- 1) At the core of halakhic terminology in the scrolls is biblical vocabulary. Numerous terms, many not discussed here, are used in exactly the same way as in the Tanakh. Other terms appear with charged, more technical halakhic meaning. Some terms, however, have been overlaid with specific sectarian connotations. Often, sectarian legal forms imply specific biblical exegesis, a characteristic of many terms used in the scrolls.
- 2) Numerous terms are used in ways also found in rabbinic literature. This is because many terms not occurring in the Bible were in general use, although not attested. Others are new terms used by the sectarians, as they were used by other Jews, including the Pharisees. It is doubtful that we should consider direct Pharisaic influences as an explanation for this phenomenon.
- 3) Some terms without biblical basis were coined by the sectarians. These are a small minority of the words we studied.
- 4) The sample of terms we discussed indicates the complexity of the vocabulary of Jewish law that was in use among the sectarians. Apparently, the halakhic system of the Sadducee/Zadokite trend was extensively developed and very complex. It rivaled the complexity of the Pharisaic-rabbinic legal system as it must have been at that time—way before the full flowering of tannaitic times.

(125) E. Qimron and J. Strugnell. *Qumran Cave 4.V: Miḡṣat Ma'aśe ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 83-101.

(126) J. K. Lefkovits, *The Copper Scroll (3Q15): A Reevaluation* (Leiden: Brill, 2000) 18-19; L. H. Schiffman, "The Architectural Vocabulary of the Copper Scroll and the Temple Scroll," in *Copper Scroll Studies*, (eds. G. J. Brooke and P. R. Davies; JSPSup 40; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 180-95.

- 5) We have sought to demonstrate that for large numbers of words, the halakhic usage goes way beyond the root definition of the word—that explained simply by its etymology. It is this characteristic that allows us—better: obligates us—to deal with the halakhic terminology of the scrolls. Often, only when the complex definitions of these words are recognized, can the correct meaning of the text be determined. Furthermore, only a proper recognition of the complex and detailed nature of these terms allows a proper understanding of the nature of the sect's halakhic traditions and of the halakho-centric nature of the inner Jewish debates in Second Temple times.
- 6) The last point I want to make is that the use of rabbinic material in preparing *The Theological Dictionary of Qumran Literature* is essential. We have shown this without question regarding halakhic terms. But the value of Talmudic material for many terms in our dictionary is substantial, and use of these texts will significantly help us to understand many terms. I close with a plea to colleagues to extend their interests and skills in order to greatly improve the quality and usefulness of our project.

Lawrence H. SCHIFFMAN

DO THE SCROLLS SUGGEST RIVALRY BETWEEN THE SONS OF AARON AND THE SONS OF ZADOK AND IF SO WAS IT MUTUAL?*

Introduction

WE HAVE now been in the fortunate position of having the full corpus of non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls at our disposal for well over a decade. Those who are new to the field will take this situation for granted and allow the rest of us to feel like ancient pioneers. One might have expected that having the full spread of the evidence in front of us would present us with all the answers that we have been looking for. However, the full corpus of texts has many holes in it — sometimes more holes than preserved text — and even where plenty of text is preserved I think it is fair to say that we are now still short of just as many answers and often even reformulating the questions.

Another consequence that arose from beholding the full spectrum of texts is that a number of erstwhile key concepts no longer emerge as dominant as we once thought they were. I have recently noted in a different context that the dualism between light and darkness, for instance, emerges as a much less central concept in the corpus as a whole than it did in the initial phases of Qumran research. (1) In the early decades of Qumran study the notion of dualism between light and darkness was prominent in two major texts: the *Community Rule* and the *War Scroll* from Cave 1. More recently a much more limited proportion of the corpus of the Dead Sea Scrolls

* I would like to thank Prof. Fabry for the generous hospitality during the ThWQ Symposium hosted at the University of Bonn in November 2008.

(1) Cf. C. Hempel, "The Teaching on the Two Spirits and the Literary History of the Community Rule," in *Dualism at Qumran* (ed. Geza Xeravits; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, forthcoming).

and not even all the manuscripts of the Rule can be drawn upon to uphold this dominance. (2)

One of the many aspects of British culture that I have come to admire is the support for the underdog and the perhaps implied resentment of top-dogs. One candidate for top-dogs who have seen their role challenged in the textual picture that emerged in recent years are the sons of Zadok. (3) A debate flared up already in the late 1980s about whether or not the groups behind the scrolls were Zadokites or not. I am thinking here of Philip Davies' plea to "stop talking Zadokite." (4) More recently, the full corpus of non-biblical Scrolls has delivered a double blow to this group. Firstly, the new evidence from Cave 4 has revealed many more references to the sons of Aaron than to the sons of Zadok, as the following table illustrates: (5)

TABLE 1: DISTRIBUTION OF THE DESIGNATIONS SONS OF AARON AND SONS OF ZADOK IN CAVES 1 AND 4 AS WELL AS CD. (6)

	בני צדוק	בני אהרן
Cave 1	x 6	x 7
CD	x 2	x 0
Cave 4	x 3	x 18

(2) Thus, 4Q258 lacks the Treatise on the Two Spirits altogether and begins with the equivalent of IQS V,1, cf., e.g., P. S. Alexander and G. Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX: Serekh Ha-Yahad and Two Related Texts* (DJD 26; Oxford: Clarendon, 1998), 90.

(3) See the seminal early treatment by J. Liver, "The 'Sons of Zadok the Priests' in the Dead Sea Sect," *RevQ* 6 (1967): 3-30. More recently see R. A. Kugler, "Priests," in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. L. H. Schiffman and J. C. VanderKam; New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), II, 688-693; *idem*, "Priesthood at Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (ed. P. Flint and J. C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), II, 93-116; and G. Vermes, "The Leadership of the Qumran Community: Sons of Zadok — Priests — Congregation," in *Geschichte-Tradition-Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Cancik, H. Lichtenberger, and P. Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), I, 375-384.

(4) P. R. Davies, *Behind the Essenes: History and Ideology in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (BJS 94; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 51-72, here 71. See also G. Klinzing, *Die Umdeutung des Kultus in der Qumrangemeinde und im Neuen Testament* (StUNT 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1971), 136. Further, M. L. Grossman, *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study* (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 185-209.

(5) See also the discussion in H.-J. Fabry, "Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran," in *Das Manna fällt auch heute noch: Beiträge zur Geschichte und Theologie des Alten, Ersten Testaments*. FS E. Zenger (ed. F.-L. Hossfeld and L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger; Freiburg: Herder, 2004), 201-217, esp. 209-210.

(6) Cf. Martin G. Abegg, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. Volume One: The Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran* [Parts 1-2] (Leiden, Brill, 2003), 12 and 631.

Secondly, the Rule manuscripts mirror this larger development by presenting us with Cave 4 copies that lack key endorsements of the sons of Zadok found in the opening lines of *1QS* V, most famously in *4QS^d* I and *4QS^b* IX. (7) In order to make sense of the plentiful evidence now in front of us, I found it helpful a couple of years ago to take a close look at the picture that emerges from the non-biblical scrolls about the sons of Aaron. In doing so I was inspired by an article published by Heinz-Josef Fabry entitled “Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran.” (8) My own results appeared in 2007 in the *Festschrift* for Florentino García Martínez. (9) Here, I would like to try and make sense of my findings with respect to the sons of Aaron by relating them to the evidence of the Scrolls about the sons of Zadok.

In his contribution to a multi-volume *Festschrift* for Martin Hengel, Geza Vermes perceived the importance of this issue when he notes the way in which “the terminological clash between sons of Zadok and sons of Aaron largely remained untouched for some four decades of Qumran research during which period most scholars [...] happily and simply maintained, without any proviso, that the sect was governed by the sons of Zadok the priests...” (10)

In what follows I will discuss all the texts in the corpus of the non-biblical Scrolls that refer to the sons of Zadok.

The Damascus Document

A number of references to the sons of Zadok in this document led Solomon Schechter to publish the mediaeval Cairo manuscripts under the title *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. I. Fragments of a Zadokite Work* in 1910. (11) This title still has strong supporters

(7) Cf. G. Vermes, “Preliminary Remarks on Unpublished Fragments of the Community Rule from Qumran Cave 4,” *JJS* 42 (1991): 250-255; P. S. Alexander, “The Redaction-History of *Serekh ha-Yahad*: A Proposal,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 437-453; A. I. Baumgarten, “The Zadokite Priests at Qumran: A Reconsideration,” *DSD* 4 (1997): 137-156; M. Bockmuehl, “Redaction and Ideology in the Rule of the Community (1QS/4QS),” *RevQ* 18 (1998): 541-560; J. H. Charlesworth and B. A. Strawn, “Reflections on the Text of *Serek ha-Yahad* Found in Cave IV,” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 403-435; P. Garnet, “Cave 4 MS Parallels to 1QS 5:1-7: Towards a *Serek* Text History,” *JSP* 15 (1997): 67-78; C. Hempel, “Comments on the Translation of 4QS^d I.1,” *JJS* 44 (1993): 127-128; and M. A. Knibb, “Rule of the Community,” in *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Schiffman and VanderKam), II, 793-797 and S. Metso, *The Textual Development of the Qumran Community Rule* (STDJ 21; Leiden: Brill, 1997).

(8) See note 5 above.

(9) Cf. C. Hempel, “The Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez* (ed. T. Hilhorst, E. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; JSJSup, 122; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 207-224.

(10) “Leadership of the Qumran Community,” 379.

(11) Solomon Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries. I: Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge: CUP, 1910).

today. (12) However, the number of occurrences of the designation the sons of Zadok in the *Damascus Document* is actually rather small and dwarfed by references to the sons of Aaron (see Table 1 above).

The first two out of a total of three references to the sons of Zadok in the *Damascus Document* occur in CD IV as part of a citation and interpretation of *Ezekiel* 44:15. Whereas the Masoretic text of *Ezek* 44:15 speaks of one group ("the levitical priests, the sons of Zadok"), it has frequently been observed that the verse as quoted in the *Damascus Document* mentions three groups: the priests, the levites, and the sons of Zadok. The subsequent interpretation identifies each group with the members of the new movement in three subsequent phases of its existence. The priests are interpreted as "the converts of Israel who went out from the land of Judah," the levites are identified as those who joined them (in a pun on the verb לָוֶה as already in *Num* 18:2 and 18:4), and the sons of Zadok as the elect of Israel at the end of days. The following observations point towards a use of the terminology here that is rather distinctive from the references to the sons of Zadok in the *Community Rule* for instance:

- The context and genre is clearly and explicitly exegetical, and Grossman rightly draws attention to its similarity to the *peshet* interpretation. (13)
- The context is eschatological (14) (although the text apparently envisages a realized eschatology): the sons of Zakok are the chosen ones of Israel who stand up in the last days, an expression referring to "the final period of history" as noted by Steudel. (15) Given the passage continues by announcing a list of their names and deeds (now lost) it seems clear that this latter group has already appeared.
- Connected to this is the chronological and somewhat hierarchical aspect of the description here as well as elsewhere in the Admonition. The emergence of the community is often described as a multi-tier process (16) with a clear hierarchical pecking order leaving us in little doubt that the final stage is the crowning moment of the development. (17) The implica-

(12) The earlier title is favourably recalled by J. M. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document (4Q266-273)* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 1.

(13) *Reading for History*, 187.

(14) See also Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 69.

(15) A. Steudel, "אֲחֵרֵי הַיָּמִים in the Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993): 225-246, here 231.

(16) Cf. C. Hempel, "Community Origins in the Damascus Document in the Light of Recent Scholarship," in *The Provo International Conference on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Technological Innovations, New Texts, & Reformulated Issues* (ed. Donald W. Parry and Eugene Ulrich; STDJ 30; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 316-329.

(17) *Pace* Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 54, who denies any hierarchical implications here.

tion seems to be that the emergence of the sons of Zadok is a high point. Remarkably this is the case both here and in *IQS* V where the reference is to the sons of Zadok as community leaders. Despite the important difference, i.e. *CD* IV referring to the whole community rather than priestly leadership as is the case in *IQS* V, I think we can pick up a common trend characterizing this terminology in both cases. This common trend is an effort to position the sons of Zadok at the front of the line or on top of the pile. (18)

- We noted already that, in the Admonition of the *Damascus Document*, the designation the sons of Zadok appears to refer to the community as a whole rather than its priestly leadership. (19) It is nevertheless interesting that the community is described in sacerdotal language. This choice of language is indicative of Zadokite sympathies. By contrast, more widespread across the corpus of the Scrolls, and importantly also elsewhere in the *Damascus Document*, the community is conceived of as being made up out of a priestly alongside a lay component (Israel and Aaron, cf., e.g., *CD* I,7 // 4Q266 2 i 11 // 4Q268 1:14; *CD* VI,2 // 4Q267 2:8). This is also true with reference to the messianic future which is said to be inaugurated by the arrival of the Messiah of Aaron and Israel (cf., e.g., *CD* XIX,11; XX,1; *CD* XII,23; *CD* XIV,19 // 4Q266 10 i 12 // 4Q269 11 i 2). This larger picture hints at the somewhat distinctive use of language in *CD* IV, even within the context of the Admonition at large. We may note in this context that an unpublished dissertation submitted to the University of Edinburgh in 1988 by Mark Boyce proposed distinguishing three types of material in the Admonition: poetry, redactional material and midrashic material. (20) Not surprisingly both occurrences of the sons of Zadok in *CD* IV fall within Boyce's group of midrashic texts. Boyce's call to distinguish between poetry and midrashic layers in the Admonition of the *Damascus Document* deserves more exploration.

Fabry has rightly drawn attention to the fact that we need to differentiate carefully between different parts of the Damascus tradition

(18) P. Wernberg-Møller even proposed that *IQS* V contains a clear 'echo' of *CD* III-IV and further argues that the references to the sons of Zadok in *IQS* V are a "late — and misunderstood — version" of *CD* III-IV, cf. "צדק, צדיק and צדוק in the Zaokite Fragments (CDC), the Manual of Discipline (DSD) and the Habakkuk-Commentary (DSH)," *VT* 3 (1953): 310-315, here 313 and 314. See also Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 58.

(19) See Grossman, *Reading for History*, 192-194, 201.

(20) See M. Boyce, *The Poetry of the Damascus Document* (Edinburgh: Dissertation, 1988).

when evaluating the evidence of the designations for the priesthood. In a paper he presented at a conference held at the University of Birmingham in 2007 he distinguishes between *CD* and *4QD* (and even within *4QD*) and finds a rather distinctive profile in each group of manuscripts. (21) I am grateful to him for drawing attention to this, and I think this point deserves much further thought. I personally never found any evidence in favour of a Cairo recension — mediaeval or otherwise — of the *Damascus Document*. With the notable exception of the difficulties posed by the differences between the mediaeval manuscripts A and B, (22) the textual history of the *D* manuscripts is much more stable than that of the *Rule* manuscripts. This, to me, is remarkable. Equally noteworthy is the closeness between the penal code traditions in *D* and the *S* penal code, and this part of *D* has received an extraordinary amount of scholarly attention in order to understand and shed light on the literary development of *S* and *D*. (23) Thus, the place where the new Cave 4 manuscripts of the *Damascus Document* throw light on highly significant textual inter-relationships is not between the ancient Qumran manuscripts of this document and the two mediaeval *CD* manuscripts but between the *Damascus Document* and the *Community Rule*. Going back to Fabry's point, I do not believe, therefore, that associating differences

(21) Cf. H.-J. Fabry, "Priests at Qumran – a Reassessment," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Texts and Context* (ed. C. Hempel; Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

(22) The literature devoted to the divergences between *CD* Manuscripts A and B is extensive. Reference may be made to a number of recent studies which also contain details of earlier discussions, cf. Liora Goldman, "A Comparison of the Genizah Manuscripts A and B of the Damascus Document in Light of Their Peshar Units," in *Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls IV* (ed. M. Bar-Asher and D. Dimant; Jerusalem: University of Haifa / Bialik Institute, 2006), 169-189 (Hebrew, English abstract XIV); S. Hultgren, *From the Damascus Covenant to the Covenant of the Community: Literary, Historical and Theological Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STDJ 66; Leiden: Brill, 2007), esp. 5-76; and M. Kister, "The Development of the Early Recensions of the Damascus Document," *DSD* 14 (2007): 61-76.

(23) See, e.g., J. M. Baumgarten, "The Cave 4 Versions of the Qumran Penal Code," *JJS* 43 (1992): 268-276; C. Hempel, "The Penal Code Reconsidered," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies Published in Honour of Joseph M. Baumgarten* (ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez and J. Kampen; STDJ 23; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 337-348; Jutta Jokiranta, "Social Identity in the Qumran Movement: The Case of the Penal Code," in *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (ed. P. Luomanen, I. Pyysiäinen, and R. Uro; BIS 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 277-298; S. Metso, "The Relationship Between the Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery. Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center, 4-8 February 1998* (ed. J. M. Baumgarten, E. G. Chazon and A. Pinnick; STDJ 34; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 85-93; A. Shemesh, "The Scriptural Background of the Penal Code in the *Rule of the Community* and *Damascus Document*," *DSD* 15 (2008): 191-224 and C. Newsom, *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004).

in the use of priestly designations with *CD* and *4QD* respectively tells the whole story. Another way of putting it might be to note that the references to the sons of Zadok are found predominantly in the Admonition and the references to the sons of Aaron are found exclusively in the Laws.

The third and final reference to the sons of Zadok in the *Damascus Document* is of immense interest. The only reference to the sons of Zadok attested in the Cave 4 manuscripts (*4Q266* 5 i 16) is part of an intriguing passage that contains material reminiscent of both the Admonition and the Laws (*4Q266* 5 i / *4Q267* 5 ii). (24) In a table outlining the contents of the *Damascus Document* in his *editio princeps* of the *4QD* manuscripts Joseph Baumgarten refers to this material under the heading, "The overseer, the priests, introduction to laws" and locates it after the catalogue of transgressions and just before the rules on the disqualification of priests. (25) In his reconstruction of the *Damascus Document*, Stegemann places this fragment at the beginning of the Laws and at or near the juncture between the Admonition and the Laws. (26) In my monograph on the Laws of 1998 I dealt with this material in a chapter entitled "Transitional Passage Introducing the Laws". (27)

This material is attested also in *4Q267* 5 ii (although this manuscript breaks off before we get to the reference to the sons of Zadok). This *4QD* passage uniquely combines references to the 'returnees/penitents of Israel' (שְׂבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל) and 'the sons of Zadok' (בְּנֵי זָדוֹק) with references to the figures of the *Maskil* (מַשְׁכִּילִין) (28) and *Mebaqqer* (הַמְּבַקֵּר) otherwise not familiar from the Admonition. (29) When I first struggled with this passage I was struck by the way in which it offers us almost something of a missing link between the Admonition and the Laws. Only when looking at it again in the context of studying the references to the sons of Zadok in the *Damascus*

(24) See Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 4-5; 47-49; C. Hempel, *The Laws of the Damascus Document: Sources, Traditions and Redaction* (STDJ 29; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 171-174; *eadem*, *The Damascus Texts* (Companions to the Qumran Scrolls 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 34.

(25) *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 3-5.

(26) Cf. H. Stegemann, "Towards Physical Reconstructions of the Qumran Damascus Document Scrolls," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (ed. Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick), 177-200. He is followed by C. Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (Atlanta, SBL, 2005), 34.

(27) See Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, 171-174.

(28) Baumgarten's partial reconstruction of a reference to the *Maskil* in *4Q266* 5 i 17 is supported by the context which comprises a formula (אֵלֶּה הַחֻקִּים לְמַשְׁכִּילִין) also found in *CD* XII, 20-21 and *IQS* IX, 12 // *4Q259* III:6-7, cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 48.

(29) For the sake of completeness we should note that the editor proposes reconstructing a reference to the *Maskil* in the Admonition, i.e. in the opening words of the document in his edition of *4QD^a* 1 a-b, but that is somewhat conjectural, cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 31-32.

Document did I realize that this mixed or transitional passage is for the most part intriguingly close to the *Ezek* 44:15 Midrash dealt with above rather than the Admonition as a whole. Only here and in the opening lines of *CD* IV do we come across the phrases ‘the returnees of Israel’ and ‘the sons of Zadok’ side by side.

The texts in question read as follows:

<p><i>CD</i> III,20b-IV,5a (30)</p> <p>20b הוא כאשר 21 הקים אל להם ביד יחזקאל הנביא לאמר הכהנים והלויים ובני 4:1 צדוק אשר שמרו את משמרת מקדשי בתעות בני ישראל 2 מעלי הם יגישו לי חלב ודם <i>vacat</i> הכהנים הם שבי ישראל 3 היוצאים מארץ יהודה והנלויים עמהם <i>vacat</i> ובני צדוק הם בחירי 4 ישראל קריאי השם העמדים באחרית הימים הנח פרוש 5 שמותיהם...</p>	<p>4Q266 5 i 9-19 parallel in 4Q267 5 ii <u>underlined</u> (31)</p> <p>9 המחזי[ק]ים בשם קוד[ש] ה[ם] (32) 10 [יה כי ביהודה נמ]צא קש[ר] 11 [לשוב על עונת אבותם] לישראל 12 בעומד[] י 12 [ביושבי ירושלי]ם <i>vac</i> וכול הנשא[רים] 13 [איש (ל) לפי רוחו] יקר[בו] 14 [וח]חק[] { } לפי המבקר 15 יתהל[כו] כם <i>vac</i> כול שבי ישראל[] 16 [בני צדוק הכהנים הנח]ה 17 מדרש ה[תורה האחרון] <i>vac</i> ואלה הח[ו]ק[ים] למש[כיל] 18 [בם לכול ישראל כ' לויוש]יע אל 19 [בדרכו] להתהלך ימ[ים]</p>
---	--

<p><i>CD</i> III,20b-IV,5a (33)</p> <p>3:20b This was in accordance with what</p>	<p>4Q266 5 i 9-19 parallel in 4Q267 5 ii <u>underlined</u> (34)</p> <p>9 [those who hold] fast to [his] ho[ly] name, th[ey]]</p>
--	--

(30) For the Hebrew text of *CD* see M. Abegg in E. Tov (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scroll Electronic Library* (Leiden: Brill, 2006).

(31) For the Hebrew text of 4Q266 and 4Q267 see J. M. Baumgarten in Tov (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scroll Electronic Library*. See also Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 47-48, 101, Plates VI and XIX.

(32) 4Q266 5 i 9 reads בשם קוד[ש] ה[ם] whereas 4Q267 5 ii 1-2 has בשם הק[דוש] המה, cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 47, 101, Plates VI and XIX. There appear to be faint traces of a letter after *shin* in 4Q267 on Plate XIX, however.

(33) The English translation is a slightly adapted form of the translation offered by M. A. Knibb *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 300 2; Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 33.

(34) The English translation is my own.

<p>21 God had established for them through Ezekiel the prophet: 'The priests and the Levites and the sons</p> <p>4:1 of Zadok who remained in charge of my sanctuary when the children of Israel went astray</p> <p>4:2 from me, they shall offer me fat and blood.' The priests, they are the converts of Israel</p> <p>4:3 who went out from the land of Judah, and <the Levites are> those who joined them, and the sons of Zadok, they are the chosen ones</p> <p>4:4 of Israel, the renowned men who shall appear at the end of days. Here is an exact list</p> <p>4:5 of their names.....</p>	<p>10] for in Judah has been fou[nd <u>conspiracy</u> []</p> <p>11 <u>To return</u> [to the sins of their fathers] for Israel <u>when it arises</u> []</p> <p>12 [<u>Jerusalem</u>]. <i>Vacat.</i> <u>And all</u> those who are <u>left o[ver]</u>]</p> <p>13 <i>Everyone according to [his] spirit [shall draw] near</i></p> <p>14 [] <i>they shall leave according to (the decision of) the overseer and [al]l</i></p> <p>15 <i>[they shall wa]lk in them.</i> <i>Vacat.</i> All the converts of Israel []</p> <p>16 [the s]ons of Zadok the priests behold the[y]]</p> <p>17] the latter [interpretation of the] law. <i>Vacat.</i> And these are the statu[te]s for the wise lea[der]</p> <p>18 [] in them for all Israel for [God] will not sa[ve]] all []</p> <p>19 [] in his way to walk perfect[ly]</p>
---	---

A number of terminological correspondences deserve noting (and are marked in bold in the texts): (35)

- Both passages speak in terms of Judah and Israel with Judah being the negative entity in both texts.
- The designation 'the returnees of Israel' (שְׁבִי יִשְׂרָאֵל).
- The references to the sons of Zadok / the priests. 4Q266 has a phrase closer to the MT of *Ezekiel* 44:15 by referring to 'the sons of Zadok the priests' as one group in line 16.
- The distinctive use of the third person masculine plural pronoun 'they' הֵם. This feature provides a connection between 4Q266 5 i lines 9-12 and lines 15-16. The former is based on *Jeremiah* 11:9-11 as noted already by Baumgarten. (36)

The transitional passage attested in 4Q266 5 i // 4Q267 5 ii which occurs somewhere between the Admonition and the legal part of the *Damascus Document* is extremely intriguing, and it is difficult to fathom the connection of the material so reminiscent of CD III-IV

(35) See also Wernberg Møller, "צדוק and צדיק, צדק."

(36) Cf. *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 49.

to a brief statement on what looks like the admission process (cf. the use of the verbs קרב 'drawing near' and רחק 'leaving, keeping a distance' at the word of the overseer) in lines 13-15a and printed in italics in the texts above. Cecilia Wassen recently also related the latter fragmentary lines to the admission process. (37) I am still none the wiser now than when I wrote in my 1998 book: "...it is difficult to see how 4QD^a 5 i 13-14.17b relates to the remainder of this passage." (38) However, Wassen's recognition of the clear connection between the reference to the latter interpretation of the law both here (4Q266 5 i 17) and at the very end of the *Damascus Document* as preserved in 4Q266 11:21 lends further support to my conclusion in 1998 that this material goes back to a late stage in the growth of the *Damascus Document* and should be attributed to a 'Damascus Redactor' responsible for the shape of the document as a whole. (39) Be this as it may, what is extremely interesting for our present purposes is that the part of this transitional passage that I previously described as reminiscent of the Admonition as a whole is especially close to the *Ezekiel* midrash in CD III-IV. Thus, all three references to the sons of Zadok in the *Damascus Document* seem to occur in comparable, exegetical-midrashic contexts, and we will come across two more such examples (4Qpesh^c Isaiah^c and 4QFlorilegium) below. This trend points towards a sizeable strand in the Dead Sea Scrolls where 'the sons of Zadok' occur imbedded in interpretation of scripture, a phenomenon that never happens with the designation 'the sons of Aaron.' I am not sure we should think of CD III-IV being quoted in 4Q266 and 4Q267 since interestingly 4Q266 is closer to the MT of Ezek 44 than CD by speaking of 'the sons of Zadok the priests behold the[y are...]' rather than of three different groups.

The remainder of the Laws contains six references to the sons of Aaron and none to the sons of Zadok. The catalogue of transgressions mentions someone who neglects to "[give to] the sons of Aaron [the fourth (year)] planting," cf. 4Q270 2 ii 6. The fascinating material on priestly disqualifications refers to the sons of Aaron four times. In this context Fabry makes the valuable observation that this particular set of references implies criticism of the sons of Aaron or is, at the very least, not uniformly complimentary but ambiguous. (40) Again I think Fabry has put his finger on something that can fruitfully be probed further. There is no doubt that the material on priestly disqualifications in the *Damascus Document* draws attention to a variety of shortcomings of some of the sons of Aaron. The question is

(37) See *Women in the Damascus Document*, 135. See also Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, 173.

(38) *Laws of the Damascus Document*, 174.

(39) See Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document*, 34 and Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, 174.

(40) Cf. "Priests at Qumran – A Reassessment."

whether this constitutes evidence that this material is somewhat anti-Aaronitic? Or, as seems more likely to me, are those voicing the critique better seen as fellow sons of Aaron who have kept on the straight and narrow? The particular situations outlined in 4QD are:

1. “[one] of the sons of Aaron who is taken captive by the nations” (4Q266 5 ii 5 // 4Q267 5 iii 8). (41) Here it seems beyond doubt that the capture by the nations is hardly the chap’s fault.
2. The situation is rather more severe in the second case which speaks of “one of the sons of Aaron who departs to ser[ve the nations” (4Q266 5 ii 8). (42) Moreover, if the following line is still dealing with this case the same person is accused of instructing “his people in the foundation/basic principles of the people and also to betray.” Even though, it is worth noting that this still points towards an aberrant individual (אִישׁ מִבְּנֵי אֹהֲרֵן) rather than a critique of the sons of Aaron as a group or category.
3. Similarly an aberrant member of this group seems to be in mind when we read of “[one of the sons of] Aaron who causes his name to fall from the truth (corrected to: whose name was thrown נִפְלָהּ > הוּא.) from the peoples (אֲמֹת > אֲמֵת) (43) (4Q266 5 ii 9-10). (44)
4. The final example seems to be either neutral or even positive by using the phrase “from Israel, the counsel of the sons of Aaron” (4Q266 5 ii 12). (45)

It is also instructive to take into account a number of further concerns raised in 4Q266 5 ii // par. even if the text speaks of priests in general rather than the sons of Aaron. The opening lines on priestly disqualification speak of priests with various types of defective speech, poor eyesight, or being somewhat slow-witted [אִין מִמָּהֵר לֵהֲבִין] who are excluded from reading the book lest they seriously mislead, cf. 4Q266 5 ii 1-4 // 4Q267 5 iii 1-7 // 4Q273 2. (46) The reference to “his brothers the priests” in 4Q266 5 ii 4 makes it clear these individuals are priests. The fragmentary remains of this material do not

(41) Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 49-52, 102. Note Grossman’s pertinent observation, “... a reading of this text at face value undercuts most of the authoritative claims made in texts like Ezra / Nehemiah or Chronicles, by identifying all of the post-exilic priestly leaders as unfit for service.” 200.

(42) Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 49-52.

(43) The text appears to be corrected from “fallen from the truth” to “was thrown from the peoples,” cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 51. The latter would correspond more closely with the interest of this passage in gentiles. By contrast, the reference to someone who has departed from the truth has a more restricted ring to it and is reminiscent of the penal code as noted by Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 51.

(44) Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 49-52.

(45) Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 49-52.

(46) Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 49-52, 102, 195.

attest the designation the sons of Aaron but the language used here leaves us with a rather harmonious impression: his brothers, the priests, will step into the breach. In short, it seems to me that what is at issue may be less critical of the sons of Aaron at large but rather self-reflective: the sons of Aaron themselves are aware that some of their number have shortcomings or have been aberrant, and this material is trying to address this situation. The terminology 'the sons of Aaron' seems here rather synonymous with the priests. In a personal communication with me some time ago Menahem Kister observed that in his view all the references to the sons of Aaron simply mean the priests. His assessment fits here and in a fair number of cases, but, as I hope we will see, not across the board. An understanding of sons of Aaron as simply the priests corresponds quite well with references to Aaron as the counterpart to Israel in the community make-up. Both with regard to the community's present and in the messianic future, priestly and lay components are expressed in terms of Aaron and Israel. In sum, on my reading of the text the material on priestly disqualifications in 4Q266 and parallels does not allude to rivalry or even expresses an awareness of rivalry between different priestly groups other than inadequacies in some members of the group — a rather *introspective criticism*, if you like. It is this lack of consciousness of rivalry on the part of the sons of Aaron that lies behind my choice of title for this article: Is there rivalry and if so, is it mutual? My own answer to this question is that the Scrolls do attest rivalry between the sons of Zadok and the sons of Aaron. However, this rivalry it is not mutual but rather confined to the leadership aspirations of the sons of Zadok. (47)

It is interesting to compare the priestly disqualifications material in 4QD to 4QMMT B 49-54 (48) which is referred to by the editors under the heading 'The Blind and the Deaf.' (49) Put very briefly MMT mentions difficulties that are encountered if someone blind or deaf is unable to adhere to halakhic requirements. The passage closes by stating that such individuals should not come near *טהרת המקדש*. Qimron and Strugnell refer to 11QT^a XLV,12-14 which bans the blind from the Temple city. As far as I understand Qimron and Strugnell, they are taking MMT B 49-54 to refer to laity or priests and laity. In my view, the material on priestly disqualifications in 4QD

(47) Grossman discusses the possibility that the use of the designation 'the sons of Aaron' "in the legal texts can be read with an ideological overtone: they argue for the view that any descendant of Aaron can have priestly authority in the community, and that special Zadokite status is not important.", *Reading for History*, 191.

(48) See already C. Hempel, "The Damascus Document and 4QMMT," in *The Damascus Document: A Centennial of Discovery* (ed. Baumgarten, Chazon, and Pinnick), 69-84, esp. 74-77.

(49) Cf. E. Qimron and J. Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V: Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah* (DJD 10; Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 160-161.

has much in common with this part of *MMT*:

- Both are concerned with inadvertent halakhic infringements due to a disability.
- Both texts include sight. (*MMT* adds hearing whereas *4QD* adds mental ability and speech).
- Both *MMT* and *4QD* are concerned with access to pure / holy food.

It seems at least worth raising the possibility that *4QMMT* is also dealing with priests. One detail that may mitigate against this interpretation is that *4QD* is concerned with speech (the priest who instructs) whereas *MMT* is concerned with someone not able to receive instruction (deaf). In any case, it is certainly fruitful to study both passages alongside each other.

MMT never mentions the sons of Zadok. Moreover, the question of the identity of the sons of Aaron in this text is extremely interesting. Who are the sons of Aaron / the sons of the priests in *MMT*? As is the case in the Laws of the *Damascus Document*, I do not think there is a distinction to be made in *MMT* between the terminology priests and sons of Aaron. What we would like to know is: are the sons of Aaron the same as or part of the infamous ‘they-group’? Or are they or some of them part of the ‘you plural-group’? We may further ask who would be in a position to tell them what to do? Surely the speakers are fellow priests of some kind. In which case, are we dealing with the sons of Aaron bemoaning the shortcoming of some of their number comparable to what we identified in *4QD*? Note, for instance, the formulation “some of the priests” (מִקְצַת הַכֹּהֲנִים) in the critical statement on priestly unions in *4QMMT* B 80. (50) One gets the impression that *4QMMT* also stresses that some of the sons of Aaron had shortcomings — comparable to the priestly disqualification material in *4QD* — but this is not to be equated with a wide-ranging condemnation of the whole group.

Returning to the *Damascus Document*, the final reference to the sons of Aaron occurs in a closing statement on the procedures laid down for dealing with skin disease and reads, “this is the law of *sara’at* for the sons of Aaron to separate/distinguish” (*4Q266* 6 i 13 / *4Q272* 1 ii 2.). (51) Similarly, *CD* 13:4-7a emphasizes the priestly duty to diagnose skin disease, even if the priest (הַכֹּהֵן) is a simpleton and needs assistance from the overseer. (52)

(50) Cf. Qimron and Strugnell, *Qumran Cave 4. V*, 56-57.

(51) Cf. Baumgarten, *Qumran Cave 4. XIII*, 52-54, 89-91.

(52) Interestingly this passage is preceded by another scenario with an inadequate priest, who is assisted by an able Levite. See Hempel, *Laws of the Damascus Document*, 111-114 and further literature referred to there.

In short, in the *Damascus Document* references to the sons of Aaron occur exclusively in non-community specific, often national contexts, frequently denoting nothing more than priests in distinction from laity. The three occurrences of the sons of Zadok in *CD/4QD* are all closely related to one another. *CD IV* deals with an interpretation of *Ezek* 44:15, and as we saw this interpretation seems to be reflected also in *4QD^a* 5 i // *4QD^b* which may also be based on *Ezek* 44:15 as well as *Jer* 11:9-11. (53) The designation 'sons of Zadok' is not used to refer to the priests in the *Damascus Document*, but apparently refers to the community as a whole. Finally, we noted the absence of any awareness of rivalry on the part of the sons of Aaron. On my proposed reading of the material on priestly disqualifications, this section appears introspectively aware of the odd rotten apple in the group, but there is nothing in the *Damascus Document* that is anti-Aaronitic. Rather, it appears to be taken for granted that the priests and the sons of Aaron are one and the same thing.

The Community Rule

Rather surprisingly perhaps the number of occurrences of the phrase 'the sons of Zadok' is actually rather meagre even in the *Community Rule*. We are dealing with two, maximum three occurrences, cf. *1QS* V,2; *1QS* V,9 and the possible third reference in *1QS* IX,14. (54) This statistical picture contrasts sharply with the central role attributed to the sons of Zadok in the limited number of references we have. We are faced with a rather small but extremely vocal textual minority. It is well known that the two references to the sons of Zadok the priests as community authorities in *1QS* V are lacking in *4QS^d* I and *4QS^b* IX. (55) However, as it emerges from Table 2 included below, *in each and every case where the sons of Zadok occur in 1QS there is Cave 4 evidence from different manuscripts lacking them*. In other words, not only is this a vocal minority but we also have a textual scenario where they are not there at all. This absence from *4QS* speaks perhaps louder even than the vocal minority in *1QS*! (56)

(53) The latter was noted by Baumgarten, see note 36 above.

(54) The latter reference (בני הצדוק) is often emended to read 'the sons of righteousness' (בני הצדק) on the basis of *4Q259* III:10, see Alexander and Vermes, *Qumran Cave 4. XIX*, 144-149. See also R. Kugler, "A Note on *1QS* 9:14: The Sons of Righteousness or the Sons of Zadok," *DSD* 3 (1996): 315-320.

(55) See note 7 above.

(56) The significance of the prominence of the Zadokites in the Cave 1 copy of the *Community Rule* is also rightly stressed by Grossman, *Reading for History*, 207.

TABLE 2: THE SONS OF ZADOK IN *IQS* BUT NEVER IN *4QS*

Cave 1	Cave 4
<i>IQS</i> V,2 The sons of Zadok and the multitude of the people of the community	<i>4Q256</i> IX:3// <i>4Q258</i> I:2 The many
<i>IQS</i> V,9 The sons of Zadok the priests and the multitude of the people of their covenant	<i>4Q256</i> IX:7-8 // <i>4Q258</i> I:7 The council of the people of the community
<i>IQS</i> IX,14 The Maskil is to separate and to weigh the sons of Zadok (בני הצדיק)	<i>4Q259</i> III:10 The Maskil is to separate and weigh the sons of righteousness (בני הצדק)

The *Rule* also contains two significant instances promoting the sons of Aaron as authority figures in the community (*IQS* V,21 // *4QS^d* II:1-2 and *IQS* 9:7 // *4QS^d* VII:7). (57) *Crucially here two different Cave 4 manuscripts back this up.* I include a table with the bare facts.

TABLE 3: THE SONS OF AARON IN *IQS* AND *4QS*

Cave 1	Cave 4
<i>IQS</i> V,21-22 The sons of Aaron and the multitude of Israel	<i>4Q258</i> II:1-2 // <i>4Q261</i> 1a-b:1-2 The sons of Aaron and the multitude of Israel
<i>IQS</i> IX,7 Only the sons of Aaron	<i>4Q258</i> VII:7 [Only the sons of Aa]ron

I argued elsewhere that this element of continuity between *IQS* and *4QS* is highly noteworthy and offers us important clues to the textual development of the *S* tradition. (58) On my reading of the texts (and in particular the manuscript evidence), the sons of Aaron are important communal authorities in the *S* tradition before the sons

(57) Cf. in this context the emphatic statement by Fabry, “Man kommt um die Feststellung nicht herum, dass die ältere Stufe der Gemeinderegel nicht von den Zadokiden spricht!”, “Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran,” 212.

(58) See Hempel, “The Literary Development of the *S* Tradition. A New Paradigm,” *RevQ* 22 (2006): 389-401.” Fabry also recognizes, “Die fortlaufende Redaktionsgeschichte der *S*-Literatur zeigt einen Kompetenzgewinn der Zadokiden...,” “Zadokiden und Aaroniden in Qumran,” 212.

of Zadok even had a look in. In my contribution to the *Festschrift* for Florentino García Martínez I identified a line of development as follows, “It seems likely, therefore, that we can observe a certain trajectory in the references to priestly authority in the scrolls beginning with the sons of Aaron in a national/non-community-specific context (*D*), to the sons of Aaron as priestly authorities within the community (*S*), to the sons of Zadok as priestly authorities within the community in a different literary stage of *S*.” (59)

The Rule of the Congregation

In the *Rule of the Congregation* the sons of Zadok and the sons of Aaron occur as community authorities side by side often in one and the same passage. I have suggested elsewhere that the sons of Zadok were added to *IQSa* in a very similar and perhaps even the same process as we witness in *IQS* on the same scroll. (60)

TABLE 4: THE SONS OF ZADOK AND THE SONS OF AARON
JUXTAPOSED IN *IQSa* (61)

<i>The sons of Zadok</i>	<i>The sons of Aaron</i>
<i>IQSa</i> I,2 The sons of Zadok the priests and the people of their covenant (cf. <i>IQS</i> 5:9)	<i>IQSa</i> I,15-16 The sons of Aaron the priests and all the heads of the fathers of the congregation
<i>IQSa</i> I,24-25 The sons of Zadok the priests and all the heads of the fathers of the congregation (context: overseeing the correct position of different groups during assembly)	<i>IQSa</i> I,23 The sons of Aaron (context: overseeing correct position of different groups during assembly)
<i>IQSa</i> II,3 The sons of Zadok the priests	<i>IQSa</i> II,13 [the sons of] Aaron

The Rule of Blessings

A whole section of blessings pronounced by the Maskil is devoted to the sons of Zadok (cf. *IQSb* III,22ff.). Although no one else is mentioned, the way in which the sons of Zadok are singled out

(59) C. Hempel, “Sons of Aaron in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” 214.

(60) See C. Hempel, “The Earthly Essene Nucleus of *IQSa*,” *DSD* 3 (1996): 253-269.

(61) For the Hebrew text of *IQSa* see D. Barthélemy in Tov (ed.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library*. Note that in the 2006 edition of *The Dead Sea Scrolls Electronic Library* the English translation by M. Wise, M. Abegg and E. Cook with N. Gordon inadvertently translates בני צדוק with ‘the sons of Aaron’ in *IQSa* I,24.

rather emphatically as God's chosen ones gives the impression that a need was felt to stress this status.

It is striking how much of the relatively meagre 'sons of Zadok harvest' in the corpus of the Scrolls is found in this one scroll: six out of eleven occurrences of the designation 'sons of Zadok' in the Dead Sea Scrolls are found in *1QS-1QSa-1QSB*. (62) Speaking about the Cave 1 copy of the *Community Rule* George Brooke observed in the *South African Journal of Semitics* that it is a "thoroughly priestly document" framed by a covenant liturgy and with priests at the helm of the organization. (63) It seems to me that he is right and, what is more, that we should extend his observations to apply to the collection of documents *1QS-1QSa-1QSB* — what we seem to have here is a priestly scroll or a priestly collection of texts.

4Qpeshar Isaiah^c

4Q163 22:3 refers to the sons of Zadok as part of the interpretation of *Isa* 30:1-5. Unfortunately, very little is preserved of the interpretation beyond the reference to the sons of Zadok. We would very much like to know whether the reference to the sons of Zadok applies here to the community as a whole or to priestly communal authorities. (64)

4QFlorilegium

A further reference to the sons of Zadok and the men of their council is attested in *4Q174* 1-2 i 17 (65) in a passage interpreting *Ezek* 37:23. (66) It is not possible to be certain whether 'the sons of Zadok' is applied to the community as a whole (referred to as *yahad* in the same line) or to a leading group. It is nevertheless clear that

(62) Cf. Grossman, *Reading for History*, 202 where she notes the distinctive emphasis on the sons of Zadok in what she refers to as the "constellation of texts (*1QS*, *1QSa*, *1QSB*)".

(63) Cf. G. J. Brooke, "From 'Assembly of Supreme Holiness for Aaron' to 'Sanctuary of Adam': The Laicization of Temple Ideology in the Qumran Scrolls and Its Wider Implications," *Journal of Semitics* 8 (1996): 119-145, here 123, cf. also 124.

(64) Cf. M. Horgan, *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books* (CBQMS 8; Washington DC: CBA, 1979), 102, 119.

(65) According to the physical reconstruction proposed by A. Steudel this reference occurs at *4Q174* III:17, cf. *Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschar^{a,b}): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, Gattung und traditionsgeschichtliche Einordnung des durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden* (STDJ 13; Leiden: Brill, 1993), 25, 31-32.

(66) Cf. e.g. G. J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSOTS 29; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1985) 117-119; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 261; and Steudel, *Midrasch zur Eschatologie*, 32.

like *CD III-IV* this passage is exegetical and, more particularly, also draws on *Ezekiel*.

Conclusion

In the *Damascus Document* and *IQS* the sons of Zadok are confined to a limited portion of their respective textual traditions. There may even be a connection between both pockets of Zadokite prominence across these texts, a possibility muted already by Wernberg Møller in an article that appeared in *Vetus Testamentum* in 1953. (67)

In a relatively small number of passages the sons of Aaron compete with the sons of Zadok as figures of communal authority. In the great majority of cases, however, the sons of Aaron perform traditional priestly duties, and the designation is synonymous with the priests. This widespread use of 'the sons of Aaron' for the priests matches very well the use of Aaron and Israel to refer to the make-up of the community and the messianic figures as comprising lay and priestly elements.

On a recent visit to Helsinki I learnt a great deal from my colleagues Dr. Jutta Jokiranta and Professor David Chalcraft, (68) two scholars who are at the forefront of applying social scientific approaches to the scrolls. One of the notions that I learnt from them is the insight that if we talk of a sect this notion needs to be *relational* — a group is not a sect in and of itself but *in relation* to another entity. (69) I would like to borrow that concept and apply it — heuristically of course — to the lack of rivalry I perceive in the portrayal of the priests as the sons of Aaron in the *Damascus Document*. In my view the passages speaking of the sons of Aaron, either as priests or as community functionaries, are not relational with respect to other types of priests. Put more bluntly, it seems likely that none of the references to the sons of Zadok were there when the references to the sons of Aaron were written down. By contrast, the references to the sons of Zadok in the *Damascus Document* and the *Serekh* seem to be relational indeed — whoever included them was aware that he or she was putting things right. In the *Damascus Document* the relational aspect refers to earlier forms of the community membership who came before the sons of Zadok such as the returnees

(67) Cf. Wernberg Møller, "צדק, צדיק and צדוק." See also Davies, *Behind the Essenes*, 70 who suggests, "for a short period of time only, the term 'sons of Zadok' was used of the priests at Qumran."

(68) Prof. Chalcraft is based at the University of Derby, UK and was also visiting the University of Helsinki.

(69) I am grateful to Jutta Jokiranta and David Chalcraft for numerous interdisciplinary conversations. In printed form see, e.g., Cecilia Wassen and Jutta Jokiranta, "Groups in Tension: Sectarianism in the Damascus Document and the Community Rule," in *Sectarianism in Early Judaism: Sociological Advances* (ed. David Chalcraft; London: Equinox, 2007), 205-245.

of Israel and those who joined them (cf. *CD* III,20b-IV,5a). In the *Community Rule* the sons of Aaron appear to have been in place, at least in the literature, when the sons of Zadok either take over or position themselves side by side with this group (see Tables 2 and 3 above). Whereas the sons of Aaron are a quiet presence in several *S* manuscripts as well as frequently in *D*, the sons of Zadok are presented as the crowning moment in the chronological development of the community in *CD* 4 and in the developing authority structure portrayed in 1QS. Thus, even though references to the sons of Zadok are numerically limited, and particularly prominent in the *1QS-1QSa-1QSc* Scroll, the exalted claims made on behalf of this group have successfully convinced scholars of the communities' Zadokite leanings. On closer inspection such Zadokite leanings are outweighed by the much broader textual powerbase of the sons of Aaron.

Charlotte HEMPEL

FROM SECULAR TO RELIGIOUS LANGUAGE IN 4QINSTRUCTION

SOME of the entries in the *Wörterbuch* must tackle radically different uses of a specific term in one and the same composition or in works that are closely related. A scribe can use the same word with different nuances due to change in context. But variant usage could also be explained through different literary strata. In this article I will review four such cases in 4QInstruction, and consider parallel usage in two writings with much in common with 4QInstruction, viz. Sirach and 1Q/4QMysteries.

Fools and folly

The guidelines for the *Wörterbuch* ask if the relevant term is used in a secular or religious manner. I had to ponder this question when I prepared the entry on fools and folly, אִיל and אִילת for our dictionary.

In the Tanakh אִיל is the fool that does not follow God's order of creation and commandments for life. With רשע 'ungodly' and כסיל 'the stupid' it is the antitype to the righteous. The terms אִיל and אִילת belong particularly to sapiential literature and are primarily found in Proverbs.

In Qumran literature these terms are most frequent in 4QInstruction, with four of twelve occurrences of אִיל and six of fourteen occurrences of אִילת. Of the six occurrences of אִילת four are in a fragmentary context. 4Q423 5 contains a parenetic section addressed to the farmer, introduced by "If you are [a farmer] אַתָּה אִישׁ אַדְמָה (line 5). In line 7 comes the admonition to "*comprehend* (1) the m[an] of understanding with the man of folly ["] (אִישׁ שְׂכַל אֶת בַּעַל אִילת הַן). (One may alternatively read יש שכל, "Is there understanding with the

(1) Italic font in translation indicates a restoration that may be contested. Underline in Hebrew text indicates text preserved in a parallel manuscript. I present my own translation of the texts quoted.

man of folly?”). This text contrasts אִשׁ שָׂכַל ‘the knowledgeable [m]an’ with בַּעַל אוֹלֶת ‘the man of folly’. בַּעַל אוֹלֶת is a new syntactic formation compared with the Bible. This text, with eleven lines more or less preserved, contains no indication that the man of folly necessarily ends in the pit.

4Q416 2 II,3-4 (par. 4Q417 2 II; 4Q418 8) uses the phrase באוֹלֶת ‘be captured in folly’. This admonition can be reconstructed as follows: תַּכְסֶּה [וְנִבְחַרְפַּתְנוּ] בְּהָ אַחֵר יִמְשִׁיל בֶּן אַחֵר בְּנִלְתָּכָה פֶּן אַחֵר יִמְשִׁיל בֶּן אַחֵר (2) מֵאִסּוּר: “Do not receive surety [for your inheritance lest another rule] over it, and you will cover your face by shame from him and be captured in folly”. ‘To be captured in (his?) folly’ is a real danger for the addressee, if he is not careful in his business affairs.

Three texts, two of them sectarian ones, use אוֹלֶת coupled with חֲכָמָה as a double phrase that signals totality: 4Q417 (4QInstr^c) 1 I,6-7 (par 4Q418 43-45) [וְאוֹלֶת] חֲכָמָה וְעוֹל אִמֶּת וְעוֹל חֲכָמָה [and folly] “then you will know truth and evil, wisdom [and folly]” (3), 1QH^a V,20 “You have revealed the paths of truth and the works of evil, wisdom and foll[y]”; IQS IV,24 “All men walk in both wisdom and folly”. The last reference from the Two-Spirit Treatise makes it clear that folly belongs to the life conditions of the elect. 1QH^a V,20 may be interpreted in the same direction.

In all three cases surveyed in 4QInstruction אוֹלֶת is used in a secular or worldly meaning and has no anti-salvific significance.

In 4QInstruction אוֹלֶת is used only in the phrase אוֹלֶת לֵב, a *novum* in Qumran sapiential literature. It occurs four times in 4QInstruction and once in 4Q425 (4QSapiential-Didactic Work B). This phrase may have been inspired by Prov 10:21 וְאוֹלֶת לֵב יָמוּתוּ “the foolish shall die for lack of understanding” and the antonym חֲכָמִי לֵב (Ex 28:3; Job 37:24).

The context of אוֹלֶת לֵב is preserved only in 4Q418 69 II,4-9, a rhetoric address directed to the foolish of heart where אוֹלֶת לֵב is used twice (both occurrences are partially preserved in 4Q417 5).

... And now, you foolish of heart, what is goodness to one who is not created? [What is] tranquillity to one who has not existed? And what is judgement to one who is not well founded? And what should the dead

(2) DJD’s reading באוֹלֶת is questionable. באוֹלֶת seems better founded.

(3) DJD’s restoration of [וְאוֹלֶת] in the beginning of line 7 is problematic due to lack of space for this word: A. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination. Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran* (STDJ 18; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1995), fig. 4 (plates at the end of the book); E.J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones. Reading and Reconstruction the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction* (STDJ 44; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 2001), 53. וְאוֹלֶת would fit the space available, but we would rather expect an antitype to חֲכָמָה such as Aramaic עוֹלָה ‘oppression’ (cf. the *h.l.* עוֹלָה in Lam 3:59).

say as lament over their *j[udgement]t?* [For Sheol] you were formed, and your return will be the everlasting pit, for you will be despised and [mocked in]your sin,[and the...] of its dark places shall cry out against your pleading. And all who will endure for ever, those who pursue truth, will wake up to judge y[ou].

... And then] all the foolish of heart will be destroyed, the sons of iniquity will not be found any more, and all those who support evil will be ashamed[ed] at your judgement.

These lines belong to a parenetic trial speech with eschatological contents (lines 4-15) that seek to encourage the righteous: the pious shall know that the foolish of heart will be destroyed in the end-time judgement. To belong to **לִב אִילִי** is equivalent to perdition. 'Foolish of heart' is here a religious category = those who go to the pit. This usage can be compared with the end-time scenario of *IQ27 (IQMyst)* 1 I,7, where **אִילִת** signals forces antagonistic to God: "Knowledge shall fill the world, and folly nevermore be there" (the first clause rephrases *Isa* 11:9, the second clause with **אִילִת** is added by the author of *Mysteries*).

There are passages in *Proverbs* that may have inspired our presectarian author. In 2:18-19 and 5:5 the adulterous woman leads a man to death, darkness, and Sheol. Cf. also τῆς γὰρ ἀφροσύνης οἱ πόδες 'feet of folly,' feet that lead down to death, in *Prov* 5:5 LXX.

I cannot see that the same author could have penned the warnings against being captured in folly in business life or follow the example of foolish farmers, and the longer admonitory eschatological speech where **לִב אִילִי** go down to the pit. The first two passages may be ascribed to earlier sources with wisdom sentences. In contrast, **לִב אִילִי** belongs to a later editorial stage of *4QInstruction*.

Secrets

In the Bible *raz* 'mystery' occurs only in the Aramaic part of *Daniel* (9 times, always used about mantic wisdom and [God-given] interpretation of dreams). In sectarian vocabulary *raz* is a central phrase for the mysteries or secrets of God, see e.g. *IQH^a* IX,13; XVI,6.11; XVII,23; XX,13.20. **רִזִּי פִלְא** 'wondrous mysteries' is used in *IQS* IV,6; IX,18; XI,5; *IQH^a* IX,21; X,13; XV,27; XIX,10. *Raz* is often used about the knowledge of God and His ways, which now is revealed to the members of the community. (4)

Raz is found frequently in two extra-sectarian sapiential writings that may be more or less contemporary with the Aramaic chapters of

(4) See R.E. Brown, "The Semitic Background of the New Testament *Mysterion*," *Biblica* 39 (1958): 426-48; idem, "The Pre-Christian Concept of Mystery," *CBQ* 20 (1958): 417-43; H. Barstad, "Prophecy at Qumran?" in *In the last Days. On Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic and its Period*, eds. K. Jeppesen, K. Nielsen, B. Rosendal (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1994), 104-20.

Daniel; viz. *1Q/4QMysteries* (14 occurrences) (5) and even more in *4QInstruction*. In particular *4QInstruction* loves the phrase *raz nihyeh* (37 occurrences). Also other combinations are used: *4Q417* 1 I,2.13, *4Q418* 219,2 ברו פלא; *4Q417* 1 I,4 רזי עולם. *4QInstruction* relates *raz* and in particular *raz nihyeh* to revelation. Four times *raz nihyeh* occurs with גלה 'reveal' (*1Q26* 1,4; *4Q416* 2 III,18 = *4Q418* 10,1; *4Q418* 123 II,4; *4Q418* 184,2).

In the apocalyptic context of *4QInstruction* it is noteworthy that the admonitions once use the word *raz* with a secular meaning:

If a man [has a demand] on your resources, willingly seek his face, [spe]ak accommodatingly to him, and then you can do your business. In your sh[ame] you should not speak to him, do not forsake your laws, and take well care of your secrets. If he entrusts you with a task of his, do not rest in [your soul and do n]ot let your eyes slumber until you have completed [what he re]quested, but not anything more.

4Q416 2 II,7-10

The meaning of (6) וברזיכה השמר [מאן] דה "take [we]ll care of your secrets" must be: do not reveal all your cards in business matters, but you take care of your own interests. As *raz* is the key word in the apocalyptic vocabulary of the longer discourses in *4QInstruction*, it is not likely that the author of the discourses suddenly should use the word in a strikingly different manner. This admonition may therefore be ascribed to another literary stratum than the discourses.

Different from *4QInstruction*, in *Mysteries* *raz* denotes both true and false knowledge. One should also note that *raz nihyeh* is used differently and less apocalyptically in *1Q/4QMysteries* than in *4QInstruction*. (7) *Raz nihyeh* occurs twice in the beginning of *Mysteries*: (8)

(5) A. Lange dates *Mysteries* to the mid-2nd century while Tigchelaar and I have located the work to circles close to the pre-Maccabean temple: A. Lange, "In Diskussion mit dem Tempel. Zur Auseinandersetzung zwischen Kohelet und Weisheitlichen Kreisen am Jerusalemer Tempel," in *Kohelet in the Context of Wisdom*, ed. A. Schoors (BETL 136; Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 113-59; E.J.C. Tigchelaar, "Your Wisdom and Your Folly: The Case of *1-4QMysteries*," in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Biblical Tradition*, ed. F. García Martínez (BETL 168; Leuven: Peeters, 2003), 69-88; T. Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of *4QMysteries* and *4QInstruction*," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, eds. J. Collins, G.E. Sterling, R.A. Clements (STDJ 51; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 2004), 67-87.

(6) *DJD* restores השמר [מאן] דה. I prefer השמר [לנפש] כה. The meaning of 'your secrets' would anyway be the same.

(7) Cf. T. Elgvin, "The Use of Scripture in *1Q/4QMysteries*," forthcoming in the proceedings of the 10th Orion conference.

(8) E.J.C. Tigchelaar concludes from the physical evidence that this fragment is close to the beginning of the scroll: "Notes on the Readings of the *DJD* Editions of *1Q* and *4QMysteries*," *RevQ* 81 (2003): 99-107.

[that they should discern between good and evil, falsehood and t]ruth. But only mysteries of evil did they [seek... in all]their wisdom. They did not know the mystery that will come, and did not consider deeds of ages past. They did not know what would befall them, and did not save themselves from the mystery that will come.

And this shall be to you the sign that it is going to happen: when the (astral) constellations of unrighteousness are closed, wickedness will disappear before justice, as darkness disappears before light — just as smoke vanishes and no longer exists — so shall wickedness vanish forever. And justice will be revealed like the sun that regulates the world. And all those who support ‘wonderful mysteries’ will be no more. Knowledge shall fill the world, and folly shall nevermore be there. The thing is certain to come, and the oracle is true.

1Q27 1 I,2-8, underline 4Q300 3

1QMyst 1 I,3-4 closely follows a biblical text, *Isa* 47:9-14, (9) a prophetic word of judgement on ignorant Babylon with its astrologers and soothsayers. Cf. *Isa* 47:11.13.14 “a sudden catastrophe will befall you that you did not know ... They predict...what is to befall you ... and they will not save themselves from the burning fire.” Further, both texts talk about a wisdom in vain (*Isa* 47:10).

Raz nihyeh is used in *Mysteries* only here. In this context *raz nihyeh* is a code word for God’s coming judgement (cf. *Isa* 47), which is unknown by a group that considers itself wise. *Raz nihyeh* plainly means ‘the secret the ungodly do not know,’ viz. the coming judgement that will befall them, as promised the enemies of God’s people in the ‘oracle’ of *Isa* 47 (or this inspired oracle within *Mysteries*) — cf. the peculiar expression “save themselves from the mystery that will come” וּנְפֹשָׁם לֹא מָלְטוּ מִזֶּה נִהְיָה.

This represents a different use of *raz nihyeh* than 4QInstruction’s, where the recurring *raz nihyeh* is a comprehensive term for God’s plan from creation to the end of times. (10) From different angles this usage of *raz nihyeh* in 1Q27 can be characterized as either religious or secular.

The Hebrew text of *Sirach* twice uses *raz* in a secular meaning identical or similar to what we found in 4Q416 2. Sir 8:18 warns לִפְנֵי זֶר אֶל תַּעַשׂ רִז כִּי לֹא תִדַּע מֶה יֵלֵךְ סָפוֹ, “Before a stranger you should not

(9) M. Kister, “Wisdom Literature and its Relation to Other Genres: From Ben Sira to Mysteries,” in *Sapiential Perspectives. Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls; Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center 2001*, eds. J.J. Collins, G.E. Sterling, R.A. Clements (Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 2004), 13-47.

(10) T. Elgvin, “The Mystery to Come: Early Essene Theology of Revelation,” in *Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament*, eds. Th.L. Thompson, N.P. Lemche (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998), 113-50; D. Harrington, “The *raz nihyeh* in a Qumran Wisdom Text (1Q26, 4Q415-418, 423),” *RevQ* 17 (1996): 549-53.

reveal a secret (or: do nothing that should be kept secret), for you do not know what it will engender in the end.” And *Sir* 12:11b runs **ואתה יהיה לו כמגלה רז, ולא ימצא להשחיתך, ודע אחרית קנאה** “treat him (your enemy) as one who will reveal secrets (or: Be to him as one who reveals secrets), so that he cannot destroy you, for you should know the fruits of envy” (the Greek text of 12:11 is different). *Ben Sira*’s **רז גלה** is the antonym of **שמר רז** 4Q416. This observation suggests the same linguistic milieu behind these two specific texts, located in Jerusalem/Yehud around 200 BCE.

The secular usage of *raz* in 4Q416 2 II could be the earliest testimony of the incursion of this Persian word into Hebrew texts (slightly before *Ben Sira*). These admonitions could be contemporary with the Aramaic parts of *Daniel* that may be dated around 200 BC, (11) or they could represent an even earlier source. *Daniel*, *Mysteries* and in particular the discourses of 4QInstruction convey the word with more religious connotations, which later will be elaborated in sectarian writings.

Sonship

The discourses of 4QInstruction thrice use sonship terminology, calling the addressee a firstborn son (**בן בכור**) of God: 1Q26 3,2 **כי בן בכור אתה לו לבן בן בכור**, (12) the term should probably be restored in 4Q418 69,15. (13) The context is preserved only in 4Q418 81, a fragment that preserves almost a full column of text in lofty, poetic style. Lines 4-6 (par. 4Q423 8,4) run as follows:

He made you holy among the holy ones[of all]the earth, and among all the g[od]l[y ones] He cast your lot and greatly increased your glory, and set you as His firstborn am[ong the sons of Israe]l,[and said ‘My riches] and My favour I will give you.’ O you, is not His goodness yours?

Based on priestly terminology in the text, Tigchelaar suggests that the discourse in 4Q418 81,1-14 is addressed to priests. I have suggested it talks to the enlightened addressees of 4QInstruction in general. (14)

(11) R. Kratz, “The Visions of Daniel,” in *The Book of Daniel. Composition and Reception*, vol. 1, eds. J. Collins, P.W. Flint (VT.Suppl. 83.1; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 2001), 91-113; R. Albertz, “The Social Setting of the Aramaic and Hebrew Book of Daniel,” *ibid.*, 171-204.

(12) Milik restored **כי אתה לי לבן בן בכור** *DJD* 1, 102.

(13) A small fragment that preserves the word **בן בכור** should be added to line 15, that ends with **ואתה בן** after a *vacat* that introduces a new paragraph. This fragment (inv. no 495, PAM 43.475) is not recorded in the *Preliminary Concordance* or *DJD*, it preserves a left and probably bottom margin. The colour of this small piece is darker than frg. 69, but the surface is similar. *DJD* restores **ואתה בן [מבין]**.

(14) Tigchelaar, *Learning*, 233-5; Elgvin, *An Analysis of 4QInstruction*

A few lines below the admonition not to reveal one's business secrets discussed above (p. ...), we encounter the term 'firstborn son' to describe a privileged position vis-à-vis an employer or superior.

and do not give him any tax money [..., lest his face be made bitter (15) and will fall down, and he will] command you. See that great is the zeal [of man, and deceiving is the heart more than everything, who can know [it? If you according to his will devote yourself to his service and to his powerful resources [... ,] you will advise [him and ble for him a firstborn son, and he will have pity on you as a man has pity on his only son [*and recognize that you are his servant and his chosen one.*

4Q416 2 II,10-14; par. 4Q417 2 II; 4Q418 8

This admonition continues with a defined literary unit, a *chain of admonitions* (6+5 sayings) in the vetitive. I here quote the first five sayings.

Do not prostrate yourself, lest you carry hateful feelings toward the other.

Do not stay on the watch for your tax collector, [then you would be for him like a wise servant].

Also, do not humble yourself before someone who is not your equal, then you will be [for him as an honoured father].

Do not strike someone who does not have your strength, lest you stumble and be put greatly to shame.

[Do not s]ell yourself for money. It is better for you to be a servant in the spirit, so that you serve your hard employers without payment.

4Q416 2 II,14-17; par. 4Q418 8; 4Q418 11

The use of father-son terminology in the admonitions of 4Q416 2 II,13.16 is radically different from the long discourse on the God-elect relation in 4Q418 81. The relationship between father and son and even the precious term 'firstborn son' are in these admonitions used to illuminate a hierarchic relation in work and business. Again, it is hard to imagine that the author of the theologically loaded discourse in 4Q418 81 could have phrased these admonitions.

Knowledgeable

The chain of admonitions in 4Q416 2 II,14-21 (see above) uses עבד משכיל in the meaning 'wise servant/slave' (line 15). In contrast, in the discourses the root שכל designates theological knowledge (4Q417 1 I,2; 20,2; 4Q418 81,9; 165,3). 4Q423 1-2,1-2 reuse and

(Ph.D. diss., The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997), 143-4; idem, "The Mystery to Come," 122-3.

(15) Read פניי פניי.

actualize *Gen* 2:9 and 3:6 for the enlightened addressee. In the discourses מְשִׁיל has the meaning enlightened teacher, parallel to מְבִין, while the addressee is designated בֶּן מְבִין or בֶּן מְשִׁיל; 4Q417 1 I,25 “O you,] knowledgeable son, meditate on your secrets and [reflect] on the [eternal] foundations”; 4Q418 81,17 מוֹד כּוֹל מְשִׁילָה הוֹסֵף לְקַח “take advice from all your teachers.”

In the manual for the farmer preserved in 4Q423 5,5ff. (see above, p. 155) the wise farmer is designated אִישׁ שָׂכַל and he is admonished, “B[e] wise with regard to all your crops, be insightful (הַשְׂכָּל) in your work [so that you know what is] good and what is bad!” In these admonitions שָׂכַל denotes the characteristics of the skilled farmer. This usage and even more the use of מְשִׁיל discussed above contrast the theological usage in the discourses.

Conclusion

I have surveyed four examples of secular terminology in the admonitions of 4QInstruction that stand in sharp contrast to a religious usage of the same terms in the editorially added discourses. Years ago I suggested two literary stages in 4QInstruction: An early layer of wisdom sentences that later was included in the work of a proto-sectarian author and editor who added longer discourses with a more apocalyptic and eschatological flavour. (16) Most scholars have agreed with my assertion that the author/editor included and adapted older material, but doubt that we can identify an earlier layer or postulate an earlier independent literary unit. (17)

Today I would express myself more carefully, and would not sort 4QInstruction into two clear-cut literary layers. The author/editor may have included more than one distinct parenetic work into his didactic treatise as well as independent wisdom sentences. But, as suggested above, some literary units from an earlier stage can be discerned. Earlier sources can be recognized through a particular literary form, such as the chain of admonitions in 4Q416 2 II,14-21. As demonstrated in this article, contrasting use of central terms in different sections of the work may also give important clues. Further, differences in world view or theological outlook may be discerned.

(16) T. Elgvin, *An Analysis of 4QInstruction*; idem, “Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Early Second Century BCE: The Evidence of 4QInstruction,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls Fifty Years After their Discovery. Major Issues and New Approaches. Proceedings of the Jerusalem Congress, July 20-25, 1997*, eds L.H. Schiffman, E. Tov, J.C. VanderKam, G. Marquis (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 226-47.

(17) M.J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction* (STDJ 50; Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill), 2003, 15; J.J. Collins, “The Eschatologizing of Wisdom in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *Sapiential Perspectives*, 49-65, here pp. 59-61; M. Kister, “A Qumranic Parallel to 1Thess 4:4? Reading and Interpretation of 4Q416 2 II 21,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 365-70, here p. 370.

As an example, the admonition in *4Q416* 2 III,6-8 reflects another view on the afterlife than the discourses. While the discourses expect a blessed afterlife in communion with the angels (*4Q418* 69 II,12-15; 126 II,6-10), these lines see only a blessed memory surviving the physical death: “If he puts it upon your responsibility, even until death take charge of it, and do not corrupt your soul by it. Then you will rest with the truth, and in your death your remembrance will blossom for ever, and your offspring will inherit joy.”

If the author only adapted free-floating and independent admonitions and consciously formed a composition fully his own (thus Goff, Collins, Nitzan (18)), why did he choose to include admonitions that used theological terms essential to him in a radically different manner? It would be easier for such an author to discard these sentences and look for others, or rewrite them (e.g. substituting טורד for רז) in a secular business context). This observation points to editorial inclusion of large units of sentences without rewriting.

The material presented here may serve as a warning to modern interpreters against a too concordant exegesis of central terms in closely related writings.

Torleif ELGVIN

(18) B. Nitzan, “The Ideological and Literary Unity of 4QInstruction and its Authorship,” *DSD* 12 (2005): 257-79.

THE THWQ – PERSPECTIVES OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM OF THE ADVISORY BOARD 2008

THE Symposium of the Advisory Board of the ThWQ acted as a forum for the discussion of important specifications concerning the ThWQ. (1) The project (which is already underway) does not intend to merely collect and analyse the vocabulary of the Qumran Manuscripts like a philological dictionary would do. Rather, as a “theological” dictionary it intends to portray the theology of Qumran with the help of individual lexemes. This is achieved by re-working theological areas and conceptions which are influenced and expressed by the vocabulary. In doing so, the ThWQ views itself as being contextually close to the Tanakh/OT and the “peri-testamental literature” on the one hand, and to the rabbinic literature and NT on the other. Within the framework of this double association, and alongside the analysis of the theologically relevant vocabulary unique to Qumran, the ThWQ intends to take up the semantic development of the Hebrew (and Aramaic) lexemes within the Tanakh and the Jewish literature of the Second-Temple-period. It will also analyse the reception of these lexemes in Qumran, and based on this will draw conclusions about the idiosyncrasies of the community/communities behind the scrolls and its/their literary environment. Work on the ThWQ must therefore be undertaken by experts who work professionally in these comprehensive fields.

The main task of the Symposium was to discuss or enable a range of fundamental decisions. The intention of the present text is to present the results.

1. The matter of the basis-resource

The matter of the basis-resource is pivotal for the ThWQ and was raised right at the beginning of the Symposium: (2)

(1) Warm thanks to Sarah Markiewicz for the English translation of this paper!

(2) Cf. the paper from Armin Lange in this volume, pp. 35-48

- a) primary field of texts: the manuscripts from Qumran.
- b) secondary field of texts: all the texts from the Dead Sea up to the period of Bar Kochba (*Mur, Hev, Daliyeh* etc.)
- c) tertiary field of texts: the so-called “peri-testamental literature” (*Jub, En, Testaments, Apocrypha*, etc)

2. Taxonomy of the Qumran Texts?

An overview of the texts in the manuscripts from Qumran allows for diverse taxonomies.

The classification of the texts according to their respective language — Hebrew or Aramaic — is undisputed. The view that these linguistic differences also hint at differentiated groups behind the writings is also largely undisputed. This is supported by the fact that alongside the linguistic differences, distinctions to the Hebrew text also exist in relation to content and concept.

Holger Gzella investigated the question of whether the Aramaic texts in Qumran constitute an isolated corpus. The Aramaic texts found in Qumran may reflect an independent local dialect which did not evolve in a linear way out of the “Imperial Aramaic,” but rather eluded any precise dating through its incorporation on the one hand of many old forms, and on the other of many Hebraicisms. Even attempts to achieve watertight results with the help of a linguistic taxonomy were unsuccessful. The Aramaic texts thus appear to constitute an individual cluster which sets itself apart from the rest of the textual corpus. The main feature of this cluster are: the usage of the Aramaic language, confinement to the pre-mosaic period, the clearly Diaspora-context and the lack of any kind of terminology relating to the community.

No consensus has yet been reached concerning the question of whether Aramaic texts like *Amran*; *Kehat*, *Hur* and *Melchisedek* etc. could also potentially stand in such close proximity to Qumranic ecclesiology that they should be mentioned in the rubric “sectarian.” Due to the fact that the Songs of the Sabbath sacrifice appear to be sectarian (3) (in contrast to Newsom), the sectarian category has also been opened up to a completely new spectrum in priestly-theology, which can even include such texts.

The extremely comprehensive amount of Hebrew texts should similarly not be regarded as homogenous. An initial classification into biblical and non-biblical texts would certainly not be challenged,

(3) Cp. H.W.M. Rietz, “Identifying Compositions and Traditions of the Qumran Community: The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice as a Test Case”, in *Qumran Studies. New Approaches, New Questions* (eds. M.Th. Davies and B.A. Strawn; Eerdmans: Grand Rapids, 2007), 29-52. B.A. Strawn and H.W.M. Rietz, “(More) Sectarian Terminology in the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: The Case of תמימי דרך,” *ibid.*, 53-64.

however this designation would be — correctly — disputed as being anachronistic, even though it is clear what is actually meant.

The group of “biblical” or rather “proto-biblical” texts comprises texts which, in their present form or at least in a very similar form, later became canonized and part of the Tanakh. The Greek texts which are related to the LXX should also be counted amongst these. The pseudo-biblical texts/paraphrases, the reworked/rewritten texts and the Pesharim/commentaries are also close to the biblical texts.

The further specification of the non-biblical literature results in a preliminary classification into legal-literature, liturgical texts, wisdom literature, calendrical/astronomical texts and varia. This classification is in principle indisputable because it emerges largely from external descriptions of the texts: in contrast, the question of whether these divergent textual groups emerge from the same circle of tradition or trace back to groups carrying different traditions is disputed.

Departing from the perspective of description to an analysis of the internal attributes of the texts (e.g. the terminology used for the community/people of God, the use or disuse of the various names for God, esp. the Tetragramm etc), a further differentiation comes to light which has huge implications for the ThWQ: the distinction between “sectarian” and “non-sectarian” literature. Several papers were dedicated to this topic. Florentino García-Martínez believes that this taxonomy is possible, however he questions its uselessness. Just like the earlier anachronistic taxonomies in “Textes Bibliques”-“Textes Non Bibliques” or “Ouvrages canoniques”-“Ouvrages non canoniques,” (4) the comprehensive history of early Judaism is not the suitable setting for the Qumran-texts, but rather the library itself is the decisive criterion. This library is therefore the only confidently recognizable context for every single scripture. We know nothing about the “previous existence” of these texts. The texts may disagree, but their belonging to the library is the sign that they are compatible with the ideology and the Halakha of Qumran. (5) This is pivotal.

The inclusion of these texts in the library also signifies their enculturation into Qumran. Drawing upon a few texts (i.e. *ApocrJosh* (6), *Jubilees*, *Temple Scroll*, *ApocrJer*, *DibHam*) R. Kugler (7)

(4) DJD 1, Oxford 1955, 46.49.77.

(5) Since a Spanish previous version of his paper was published in *RevQ*, we decided not to publish here the English version discussed at the Symposium. See F. García Martínez, “¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos,” *RevQ* 23/91 (2008): 383-394.

(6) In *4QApocrJosh* it is apparent, that the text contains no typical Qumranic vocabulary, even though it represents some Qumranic ideals (chronology, priestly officials, Peshar-technique).

(7) R.A. Kugler, *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*. (Early Judaism and Its Literature 9; Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1996). The *AramLeviDocument* also provides evidence of this type in

attempted to demonstrate that those texts which came from outside of Qumran were adapted or rewritten on the basis of older texts in Qumran. For all of these texts it can be said, that the Qumran Community itself shaped these texts into the form which we now know. The question of their origin is therefore irrelevant, and taxonomical distinctions should be abandoned, as all of these writings are more or less authoritative for the community.

In contrast, Francesco Zanella remained by the distinction “sectarian” — “non sectarian.” He supported and presented this taxonomy by drawing on the method of “Componential Analysis of Meaning” (8) which he optimized and adapted to the problem at hand. Through the application of this method to the Qumran texts, Zanella expected a more certain insight into the language of these texts as a “functional language,” which allowed for conclusions to be drawn about the community.

Devorah Dimant is likewise convinced that the distinction “sectarian” — “non sectarian” is applicable and should be retained. Alongside the legal-literature and the pesharim, she confirmed the semantic profile of the language of the Qumran community. The characteristics of the vocabulary largely coincide with historical allusions to these texts on the one hand, and with certain theological ideas or ideological peculiarities on the other. If all three categories agree, then the taxonomy criticised by García Martínez is certainly applicable. Dimant confirms that there is a grey area of texts which do not fulfill all three categories to the same degree. Here we must be cautious in our argumentation.

The ThWQ cannot forgo the distinction between sectarian and non-sectarian. According to Dimant, it should however focus on the sectarian texts, as the true intention of Qumran is to be found in them. This clear suggestion goes against the intention of the ThWQ, which understands all texts from Qumran as its literary source and which does not just want to analyze the sectarian texts, but rather also their literary environment.

3. Central semantic fields

A further topic of the Symposium related to the question of the central semantic fields, a paradigmatic review of which should raise awareness of possible problems in the preparation of articles for the ThWQ.

4QpsJub^a, 2QapDavid und *4QApocrJoseph*. Sidney W. Crawford warns of such a combination, as such “parabiblicals” have very different impacts and are therefore confusing.

(8) Cf. F. Zanella, *The Lexical Field of the Substantives of „gift“ in Ancient Hebrew* (Leiden: Brill, 2009) (forthcoming).

In this regard, Eileen Schuller's paper referred to a very sensitive point. Using the example of a prepared draft for an article *iššah* "woman," Schuller highlighted a problem which required a fundamental decision. Are the lexemes to be fundamentally dealt with, and their semantic to be presented as precisely as possible, in the normal lexicographical way? Or is the whole semantic field also to be onomatologically considered? In the case of *iššah*, there are textual correlations which clearly speak about the woman, even though the lexeme itself does not occur (e.g. 4Q271 3; IQSa I,11; CD V). Women are often spoken about, however terms like "mother, daughter, sister" are employed instead of *iššah*. Should an article about *iššah* then bring in further gender-related aspects and employ inclusive language (9)?

In a second paragraph, Schuller analyzes the custom of presenting statistics which is often observed in lexicon articles. Using the example of a comparison between *iššah* and *iš*, she highlighted the various problems: Because the ratio of women—men in the OT is 1:3, and in Qumran it is 1:10 or 1:8, should we then conclude that women were relatively unimportant in Qumran? If one considers that *iššah* largely occurs in the OT in *stories*, a genre which hardly ever occurs in Qumran, it quickly becomes apparent how easily statistics can mislead.

Thorleif Elgvin observes a semantic disruption in coherency in the area of 4QInstr and points out the necessity of considering redactional revisions. In doing so, Elgvin introduced a further area of consideration for work on the ThWQ. This problem should actually be clarified first, before work on the lexicon can begin. In this case, one is partly interacting with a hypothetical field, and for the moment it is inadvisable to bring such hypotheses into the ThWQ.

George J. Brooke addresses several problems in his paper: Using the example of the termini *pešær* and *midraš*, he observes that for the editing of some lemmata it is important to know the exegetical history of some of the scrolls; it did namely take almost 40 years before the *pesher* were identified as its own literary genre. Based on new approaches in linguistics he questions to what extent the etymology of the lexemes should be brought into the individual articles. The difficulty here is made particularly clear by the term *midraš*, which is already active in the semantic field of the later Mishnaic Hebrew, just like the verb *daraš*. In this regard, Brooke poses the question of which linguistic and socio-linguistic theories the ThWQ wants to subscribe to.

Hannah Harrington introduces the terminology of purity and in this context points to the significance of statistics, which make the

(9) Maxine L. Grossman, "Reading For Gender in the Damascus Document," *DSD* 11/2 (2004): 212-239.

striking concentration of the terminology on particular textual genres clear. In general, the result is to be maintained, that the language of the Qumran texts developed new expressions and phrases as a designation of the various aspects of purity. The community shows itself to be linguistically innovative, in order to express the many aspects of that which was important to them. The ThWQ must also reckon with the fact that it does not properly encompass a widely branched conception in only analysing the traditional terminology.

Lawrence H. Schiffman analyzes the legal terminology in the Qumran Texts and compares them with the data in the rabbinic literature. He problematizes the term “halakhic,” which refers to the Jewish law. However this is also true for Qumran! The term therefore gains a complex meaning. On the one hand, it is also a matter of Jewish Law in Qumran and they use the same termini. However in Qumran the termini are clearly used with different semantic coloration, as they distance themselves from the law of the Pharisees. The complex and identical set of legal terminology shows the many facettes of Jewish law. The semantic differentiations give rise to the speculation that the rabbinic Halakha had primarily developed out of Pharisaism, however the involvement of groups of Sadducees/Zadokites remained plausible.

Armin Lange attempts to define the state of the ThWQ more precisely. He discusses the various termini a quo and termini ad quem for the breadth of the textual *Vorlage* which is to be taken into account by ThWQ (cf. point 1, above). In doing so he refers to the double connectivity: the Qumran literature does not just stand historically between the OT and the NT, with some overlap on either side, but rather it also stands between the Tanakh and the Rabbinic literature! Lange also problematizes the question relating to the community behind the writings: He points to texts which contradict each other, and infers from this that the texts can potentially be traced back to two/several different communities. On the basis of the semiological change in the designation *śatan*, he provides evidence that it is only possible to adequately do justice to this term when its development from the deuteronomistic historical work through to the texts of the 1st c. BCE is traced. From this it follows that for the ThWQ a Basis-Resource should be set which is as broad as possible.

4. The Qumran community – structure and specific attributes

A third group of papers dealt with peculiarities and structures of the community in order to draw attention to the possibility of diachronic developments in the community, as well as to the possibility of a diachrony of the texts.

Charlotte Hempel assumes that groups bearing various traditions stand behind the texts of Qumran, and that their specifications and

profile have left their mark on the text, ergo which can be extraced from these texts in an analytical way. For Hempel, the point is to decipher the complicated coexistence of Zadokites and Aaronites in the Qumran Community through analyses and textual comparison, above all in the *S*- and *D*-literature. The research has revealed a dominance of the Zadokites in some texts, and a dominance of Aaronites in others. Such differences are not only apparent between *S* and *D*, but also between *1Q* and *4Q*. Does a diachronic development stand behind them, a hostile takeover even? Hempel initially attempts a genre-critical solution: Aaron is primarily found in the legal sections, Zadok in the narrative sections and admonitions. However in the comparison of *1Q* and *4Q* redaction-critical considerations have to be taken into account. Ultimately, the issue of whether such shifts in authority only occur on a literary level or whether they reflect real processes of group dynamics cannot be clarified at present.

Sarianna Metso addresses the question of how genuine information can be gained from the texts which describe the community, its organization and its practices, given that they originate out of various periods and groupings. In addition, they link their notion of a community with biblical ecclesiology, which then makes it difficult to differentiate between reality and intention. Metso makes this problem clear by analysis a few of the smaller scrolls with "organizational terminology": *4Q477 Rebukes of the Overseer*, *4Q265 Miscellaneous Rules*, *4Q279 Four Lots* and *5Q13 Rule*.

The terminology for the community employed at Qumran is largely drawn from the concepts in the exilic/post exilic Priestly Code, and is thus influenced by the image of the community as well as that of the relationship between God and the people, found in the texts. According to this, this terminology in Qumran is not aimed at an exact reproduction of the social state of the community, but rather outlines an ideal which has been developed in the bible. These writings were therefore not the necessary basis for the life of the community, but rather they constituted a collection of older legal texts and customs which served educational purposes. In contrast, the regulation of community life was based upon the foundation of the oral authority of the *rabbîm*, as well as upon the legal decisions of the community leaders.

Innovations then occurred through the use of the term יחד for the community in a range of writings, which, according to general consensus, described core Qumranic values. An analysis of יחד and its compounds עֲצַת הַיָּחַד and אֲנֹשֵׁי הַיָּחַד shows that this terminology is evidently not represented in all core texts in equal measure; it is even missing from some texts. For this reason, the terminology should probably not be overvalued if it is supposed to serve as an argument for the taxonomy "sectarian"—"non sectarian."

In her paper, Metso described the dangers which can easily mislead one's thoughts. This can happen if one, by means of the terminology, wants to expand to a rather exact picture of the actual circumstances of the community at a particular point in time. The literary development of the text, on the one hand, as well as the very divergent contextualisations with mutual synonymisations alert one to the complexity of the problem. (10)

5. Closing comments

The Symposium encouraged the editors and their staff to continue the work on the ThWQ. The intensive dialogue brought many problems to light, and contributed valuable insight. The editorial guidelines were, however, largely confirmed, and rendered more precise and clear through substantial fine tuning. It became clear that the ThWQ had taken on its work at a time when many pivotal questions relating to Qumranology were still open. The ThWQ will contribute towards making the questions more precise and paving the way for the answers.

Heinz-Josef FABRY

(10) The contribution by Sarianna Metso is not included here, we hope that she will publish it elsewhere.